The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1936 NUMBER 1102

Contents

The Week 265

Editorials

The Supreme Court Rules! 269
The President's Message 270

General Articles

Budget-Balancer Landon ..... Morton Taylor 272
Autumnal Migration (verse) .. John Vincent Healy 274
What Germany Does to the Jews ..... Dr. Kurt Rosenfeld 277
Congress and the Gag Laws .... Samuel Paul Puner 277
The Student Union Begins ..... James Wechsler 279
Route 61 ..... Nathan Asch 280
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 281
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 282
On the Labor Front ..... William P. Mangold 283

Correspondence 284

Regina Humana ..... Stark Young 286

Books in Review

Two Sides of the Barricades ..... Malcolm Cowley 287
War and Peace ..... Frederick L. Schuman 288
The Oneida Experiment ..... Martha Gruening 289
A New Parish ..... Mark Schorer 289
About T. S. Eliot ..... Newton Arvin and Alfred Kazin 290
Books in Brief 291

The Week

WORLD attention was centered upon President Roosevelt this week as he appeared before Congress at a night session and delivered his message on the state of the Union in an address broadcast to the ends of the earth. His outline of America's stand in the present disturbed situation in international affairs, coupled with the introduction of the administration's neutrality bill at the opening session of Congress on Friday, aroused the greatest interest abroad, while his fighting defense of domestic policies stimulated a furore of discussion in this country. The Supreme Court took the headlines on Monday by declaring unconstitutional the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in a six-to-three decision (Stone, Brandeis and Cardozo dissenting) so sweeping that a constitutional amendment seemed the only way of restoring the A.A.A. or providing an equivalent. On the same day the President delivered to Congress his budget for the serving until a later date a budget measure on emergency expenditures for relief.

GENERAL dismay throughout a good part of the world greeted President Roosevelt's message to Congress and the concurrent introduction of the administration's neutrality bill. Some observers in England and Geneva professed to see in the provision of the neutrality bill permitting "normal" exports of supplementary war materials a death blow to any possibility for oil sanctions against Italy, holding that such sanctions would work only if worldwide and absolute in their applications. The President's spoken reference to "those nations which are dominated by the twin spirits of autocracy and aggression" provoked angry retorts in the press of Germany and Italy, although officialdom in Japan, another nation that many people thought the President had in mind in making that reference, maintained discreet silence. As England and France began to realize the full import of the neutrality bill's provision for a mandatory embargo on war materials to all belligerents—a provision that, had it been in effect in 1914, might have reversed the outcome of the World War—a large section of the press in those countries expressed hurt and shock and urged that new sources of war supplies be arranged at once. The official press in the Soviet Union showed general sympathy with the President's stand, especially praising the denunciation of warlike aggressors. The President's reference to peaceful neighbors in the Western Hemisphere was favorably received in South America.

NETTLED by recent Ethiopian victories in raiding outposts and lines of communication, the Italian armies replied with extensive bombing expeditions on all fronts. World opinion was shocked by news that a Swedish hospital unit at Dolo had been destroyed and several members of its foreign medical staff wounded, one of them fatally, by aerial bombs, and later reports told of the bombing of Ethiopian, American and Egyptian Red Cross units. Emperor Haile Selassie sent a protest to the League of Nations, but the International Red Cross Society decided against taking any official action. On the heels of James G. McDonald's report to the League

LICENSED TO GNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cated story from London that a mass expulsion of all Jews from the Reich is being forced and that economically competent Jews throughout the world will be compelled to assume the responsibility for caring for their kinsmen driven into exile. Further moves toward the totalitarian state were made in Germany with the formation, under the auspices of the National Socialist Party, of a compulsory Reich Youth League to which all children between the ages of ten and eighteen must belong. In France, political respite was gained as a theoretically balanced budget was passed and Premier Laval remained shakily in power. Japanese advances on the Asiatic mainland slowed down this week, probably to consolidate positions already taken, and meanwhile an inflamed populace in China continued to demand of the Nanking government active resistance to Japanese aggression.

IN A book review on page 288 of this issue of The New Republic, Mr. Frederick L. Schuman returns to the attack on the neutrality policy that we favor. The greatest threats to peace today are, he says truly, the fascist dictatorships. Therefore we ought to support sanctions to restrain them. But we do not think he faces the issue quite squarely. Suppose sanctions do not restrain them? Suppose the effort to restrain them through sanctions leads to war against them? Article XVI of the League Covenant contemplates exactly that eventuality. The threat of sanctions is nothing but a mild bluff unless those who impose sanctions are ready to back them up, if they lead to forcible resistance, by military and naval force.

THIS is the inconsistency of the League brand of pacifism; it was directly responsible for the treacherous Hoare-Laval proposal to Italy. France and Great Britain were afraid to impose effective sanctions, when a concrete decision had to be made on oil, because they believed Italy would fight back. League sanctions, if effective, are not a road to peace, but to war against the disturbers of peace. There is a good case to be made for the proposition that the United States, as well as Great Britain, France and the rest of the League members, should fight Hitler, if he goes on the rampage. But that is a different objective for this country from keeping out of a horrible and disastrous war. We should have greater respect for the opinion of Mr. Schuman and the others who agree with him if they would come out frankly for a military alliance, directed against aggression by Italy, Japan and Germany.

REPORTS from London of a Nazi plot for a mass expulsion of Jews from Germany give added point to James G. McDonald's plea that the nations of the world come to the aid of the beleaguered Jewish minority in the Reich. McDonald was appointed by the League of Nations to head a commission to deal with the refugees (mostly Jews and others) coming from Germany. In deference to German feelings, the commission was set up as a coördinate body and was not established as a direct function of the League itself. It was hoped that the very existence of the commission and the moral example of its work on behalf of refugees would serve to ameliorate the situation within Germany. The exact reverse occurred. As the article by Dr. Kurt Rosenfeld in the present issue of The New Republic points out, the Jews were first deprived of citizenship and then made the victims of systematic persecution designed to take away their means of livelihood, their social and professional standing, their civil rights and, often, their very existence.

IN HIS communication to the League, Mr. McDonald gives a devastating account of Nazi injustice and says that he is forced to resign because the League commission and private agencies are simply not adequate to take care of the refugees. Some 80,000 already have fled, says Mr. McDonald, and if the pressure of newer and stricter laws is not relieved, "it is inconceivable that those who can flee will remain in Germany." He believes that the only solution is to have the nations of the world intercede in a "friendly but firm" manner. His report created reverberations throughout the world, but in Germany no part of the text was revealed, the press printed only the briefest reference to the report four days after it was issued and no official comment was forthcoming, other than oblique references to Bolshevik plots.

THINGS are happening on the waterfront. In San Francisco last week, when the S.S. "Pennsylvania" of the Panama Pacific lines prepared to lift anchor, her crew of 300 went on strike and prevented her from sailing. Their action grew out of the fact that their wages were lower than the wages paid to seamen on the Pacific Coast. Also in San Francisco, fifty coastwise cargo schooners are tied up because their crews are demanding a six-hour work day. Meanwhile, down in the Gulf ports longshoremen and other marine workers are planning to form a federation comparable to the Pacific Maritime Federation, which grew out of the successful general strike in 1934. By providing a basis for united action, the Pacific Federation has strengthened the unions there immeasurably and enabled them to maintain working conditions superior to those obtaining in any ports in either the Eastern or Gulf port districts.

IN VIEW of these developments, it is not surprising to read reports that both the shipowners and the conservative officials of the American Federation of Labor are preparing to gang up on the Pacific Coast unions. Such headlines as those recently carried by The New York Times—"Crisis Seen Near in Pacific Shipping," "War Is Demanded

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stood. For it is clear that the militant policies of the San Francisco unions have been highly annoying to both the shipping interests and the old-line A.F. of L. leaders. The victories won by the Pacific Coast unions obviously provide an impressive argument for militant strike tactics—something that conservative labor leaders dislike even more than they do company unions. It is embarrassing, moreover, for the Eastern officials of the longshoremen's and seamen's unions to have to admit that they are unable to obtain as good working conditions for their members as were obtained, say, by Harry Bridges, the "alien radical" on the West Coast. It is even more embarrassing to have their members go on strike, when they reach San Francisco, and demand Pacific Coast pay, as did the crew of the "Pennsylvania." The shipowners, accordingly, are calling for action by the Department of Justice against the Pacific Maritime Federation as an "illegal conspiracy," while the heads of international unions involved are threatening to revoke the present charters and set up new unions under "responsible" leadership.

ONE of the minor tragedies of the depression was underlined the other day when the news was published that a number of families living at Sunnyside, a model housing development in Queens Borough, New York, had been deprived of their homes by foreclosure proceedings. This unhappy sequel to the hopeful pioneering effort of the City Housing Corporation which The New Republic supported when the project was launched, indicates the difficulty of enhancing security by minor reforms under the vicissitudes of capitalism. The corporation succeeded, during the piping times of prosperity, in improving the quality of moderate-priced housing by large-scale operations and careful planning. It reduced rates of interest far below those prevailing in speculative undertakings by eliminating exorbitant finance charges and supplying the equity capital through stock issues, the return on which was limited to six percent. It then proceeded to sell the apartments and houses on small down payments, with monthly charges spread over a long period, to cover amortization, interest and taxes. A profit, made on the sale of surplus land, was used to finance a more ambitious project at Radburn, New Jersey.

WHEN the depression hit the occupants, an attempt was made to carry those who could not pay. Eventually, however, the resources of the Corporation ran so thin that the end of this relief was in sight. In the meantime, a large number of the householders had organized a union, including some who could afford to pay as well as those who could not, and demanding flat reductions of charges for all alike, on the theory that the depression had affected all values and that the investors should share the losses of the householders. The Honie the beginning of the year no payments have been made by the union members, no adjustment has been reached, and the foreclosures are the result.

THE bitterness of the quarrel between the home owners and the City Housing Corporation has produced heated charges, supported by long and complex arguments on both sides. When the union alleges that the Corporation, its officers and its technical staff are guilty of profiteering and deception, it is talking nonsense; the whole enterprise was conceived as a public-spirited experiment; no one concerned with it was looking for more than a modest return on his investment, and even this, as it turned out, has been uncertain. On the other hand, the Corporation is on shaky ground when it argues that those who can afford to pay the charges in full should do so instead of making common cause with those who cannot. There is no just reason why bond-holders and mortgagees should continue to collect the same interest and amortization as before the depression, while those who "own" the equities suffer drastic deflation if not complete loss of their homes. The City Housing Corporation does not itself own the mortgages and bonds, but it originally guaranteed them, and thus it is legally in the position of defending the lenders against the borrowers.

THIS is extremely unfortunate for both sides. The mortgage companies are apparently hiding behind the skirts of the Housing Company and are protecting their interests by pointing to its original philanthropic character. The loss, if the householder had won, would have come out of the hides of the philanthropists. All of which is very sad. In a larger aspect, the incident throws light on the effort of capital to sustain values and interest charges during general deflation—with the partial aid of the H.O.L.C. The outstanding lesson for the future, in our opinion, is that it is unsound to undertake great housing enterprises as private ventures, and that it is still more unsound to encourage home ownership among those of moderate or small incomes. We should have public housing, and it should be rented.

MISS Lola de la Torriente is at present confined in a Cuban prison under circumstances that cast small credit upon the government of the United States. Miss de la Torriente, a Cuban citizen, an author and an honorary member of the League of American Writers, entered the United States on a passport visa limited as to time. When she sought to have it renewed, this request was not granted and she was ordered deported immediately on the vague and comprehensive grounds of "social and political activities." In fact, the government insisted that she leave American soil within twenty-four hours, which, from Miami, is of course possible only by airplane. She obtained permission to go to Mexico,

CONSENT TO USE OF ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

received the solemn assurance of the American government that she would not be molested during the brief halt. This assurance was broken; the Cuban authorities, who had evidently been notified of her arrival in advance, arrested her as soon as the plane landed, and put her into prison. There are several ugly questions in connection with this affair that need answering: Why did the American authorities insist on her leaving under such circumstances that she was forced to go to Cuba? Did they conspire with the Cuban government to have her arrested? We hope these questions will be answered in the congressional investigation of the Immigration Service that is every day becoming more obviously necessary.

BLACKLISTING of the University of Pittsburgh by the American Association of University Professors seems an inevitable and rightful result of the policies pursued at the so-called "Cathedral of Learning." The very emphasis placed upon the physical plant of this forty-story skyscraper university, which was begun in the late twenties with a high-pressure collection campaign reminiscent of a Florida real-estate boom or the launching of a new subsidiary of the aluminum monopoly, showed a powerful orientation toward big-business interests. Beginning with the compulsory disbanding of a student liberal club in 1929, this impression was confirmed as, one after another, faculty members who showed progressive ideas or sympathy with the labor movement were forced to resign or fired outright. With the dismissal of Dr. Ralph E. Turner, for nine years professor of History, public opinion became so aroused that a legislative committee was appointed to investigate the conduct of the university.

THE committee's findings, made public last summer and described in an article, "Counter-Attack at Pittsburgh," in The New Republic for September 25, 1935, told of the pressure put upon Turner, Warne, Chalmers, Wing and other former members of the faculty, described the gross interference with academic freedom and detailed the system of tenure of the Mellon-controlled and self-perpetuating Board of Trustees. Governor Earle was so aroused by the revelations that he threatened to block state appropriations for the university unless the abuses were rectified. Now the American Association of University Professors imposes its blacklist, and henceforth any one of its 10,000 members who accepts a position at the University of Pittsburgh (the provision does not apply to those now on the faculty) must forfeit his membership in the association. This driving and drawing away of its best academic material would seem to strike at the very heart of a university conducted in any real sense of that word, but the reaction may be different at an institution whose Chancellor (John G. Bowman)

TIME, as everyone knows, marches on; but we sometimes wonder, on what? This lively little red-jacketed magazine undertook the other day to tell its readers about Stakhanovism in the Soviet Union. According to Time, this new system is identical with the speed-up; it means doing the same things as before, only faster. It is extremely unpopular with factory workers, so much so that a number of persons have been killed during the process of introducing it generally throughout Russia. This account is widely at variance with that presented by reputable foreign correspondents in Moscow. These persons appear to be agreed that Stakhanovism is not the speed-up, but an efficiency system similar to the ideas put forward years ago by Emerson, Taylor and others in the United States; that it is founded on time and motion studies, division of labor and abandonment of inefficient techniques. There is also general agreement that it has been received enthusiastically by the overwhelming majority of those workers who, through using the new system, have found their incomes notably increased and have been praised and fêted for helping forward the Second Five Year Plan. Query: where does Time get its facts?

A WORLD full of contradictions and confusions and uncertainties is revealed in the "World Economic Survey" of the League of Nations for 1934-35. That a general "recovery" is in process is confirmed, in each of the principal capitalistic nations except France, by an increase of industrial activity which has been fairly consistent since 1932. The unevenness of this tendency, however, is indicated by the deviations of the two extremes. Thus the trend of industrial activity in Japan had risen by 1935 to more than 40 percent above the level of 1929, while in the United States it was more than 20 percent below the level of 1929. It is noteworthy also that the average of industrial activity in the traditionally "agricultural" countries was substantially higher in 1935 than in 1929. Further light is cast on "recovery" by the fact that those countries (Japan and Chile) which have depreciated their currencies most have experienced the greatest increase of industrial activity, while those countries (the gold bloc) which have not depreciated their currencies were, in the middle of 1935, at a level of industrial activity almost as low as the "depths" of 1932. The most acute international question remains that of whether "national recovery" by each nation for itself, or the restoration of an international monetary standard, is the more effective recovery policy. At least for expediency, the former appears to be the winner.

MR. L. W. Wolcott is vice-president of the Sherwin-Williams Company of California. He is also one of the frankest exponents of the idea that government should be synonymous with business whom

DIGITIZED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to contribute money to a fund of the California Manufacturers' Association for the purpose of combatting radicalism in that state. "Business," he says, "must no longer be the prey of organized minorities. We must put an end to that wrong forever. The directors and the responsible membership of our association are willing energetically to devote their time and the best of their ability to this service as they did with success at the election last autumn (1934), and simply in the spirit in which those things have always been done in America in times of peril. The California Manufacturers' Association . . . is an organization of statewide character that has openly and without fear aggressively challenged those activities subversive to business. It is a powerful body of great influence and it may be depended upon to handle the present delicate problem professionally and successfully."—"Subversive to business" is a new and striking phrase. It implies that there is now an interest higher than the State, and that the State itself becomes "subversive" if, for example, it tries to make business pay higher taxes. Mr. Wolcott does not specify the means his association uses in the effort to keep business interests paramount, and, so far as we are concerned, he does not need to do so. They are written large on the record.

The Supreme Court Rules!

IN ITS decision holding the A.A.A. unconstitutional, the United States Supreme Court divided six to three. Six Judges held that the Constitution, adopted one hundred and fifty years ago, forbids this type of legislation; three held that it does not. Few authorities on the subject would maintain that Justices Brandeis, Cardozo and Stone, who composed the minority, are inferior as legal scholars or as experts on the Constitution to Justice Roberts, who wrote the majority opinion, or Justices Butler, Hughes, McReynolds, Sutherland and Van Devanter, who concurred in it. We shall therefore refrain on this occasion from expressing opinions as to what the Constitution might have permitted or was intended to permit, leaving the debate where it now rests, in the hands of these able advocates. We shall be content merely with drawing the obvious conclusion, that what in fact the Constitution permits depends, not upon any inexorable logic, but upon the uncertain opinions of nine mortal men.

The issue before the Court was primarily the processing tax. Mr. Justice Roberts appears to hold, on our first reading of the decision, not that the tax is unconstitutional in itself, but that the taxing power cannot be used to accomplish any object that lies outside the powers expressly granted to the federal government by the Constitution, and that the regulation of agricultural prices and production is not one of those powers. This would seem to for or to register any judgment concerning it. The A.A.A., and any other scheme for remedying their ills. Obviously the states, in which the majority of the Court declares such power resides, cannot practically exercise it. Mr. Justice Stone, who wrote the dissenting opinion for the minority, not only disagrees with this reasoning, but also feels it necessary to point out that "the courts are concerned only with the power to enact statutes, not with their wisdom." He also remarks, quite truly, that "while unconstitutional exercise of power by the executive and legislative branches of the government is subject to judicial restraint, the only check upon our own exercise of power is our own sense of self-restraint. For the removal of unwise laws from the statute books appeal lies not to the courts but to the ballot and to the processes of democratic government."

Of course no patriotic American would for a moment entertain the suspicion that what these men think has anything to do with their prejudices, their backgrounds, their legal education, their knowledge of social and economic problems, their ideas of what policies are good and what are bad, the pressure exerted upon them by their friends or by public opinion in general. Of course not! Supreme Court Justices do exactly what they are supposed to do and nothing else: that is, interpret the words of a written Constitution no matter what might now be considered advisable as legislation and no matter what interests and prejudices are affected by the result of their decision. And no patriotic American would for a moment contend that it was more important for the government to serve the needs of life today than to be restricted by even the most uncertain and fallible inferences from those ancient words. The Constitution is the Lord, and the Supreme Court is its prophet!

This decision puts a happy end to the democratic processes by which we thought that we in America had a right to consider and decide, as a nation, what our agricultural policy ought to be. For years the American farmers have been agitating against inequalities that beset them. One remedy after another has been proposed and pressed upon the government. Economists have investigated these problems and have rendered their opinions. Editors have discussed them. Candidates for office have adopted programs and defended them. Finally a scheme was voted by our representatives in Congress. It was tried. Debate concerning it has been lively for two years. Congress thought it could retain this measure or repeal it, modify it, or try a substitute for it. We are approaching a national election in which the voters would have heard further debate about the scheme and would have been asked to render their decision on it. But this long process was irrelevant. Fortunately, we now learn that all the time the Constitution forbade any such thing. We do not have to think about it any more,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any substitute for it. The embarrassing and onerous obligations of democracy have been removed by our great judicial *deus ex machina*.

The government has been obligated by contract under the A.A.A. to pay to the farmers hundreds of millions of dollars, which it cannot now collect. There are those in Congress who believe that some new way, possibly constitutional, should by an exercise of ingenuity be devised to raise this money. The problem of economic justice to the farmers, the problem of what ought to be done about farm prices and farm production, still faces the American people. Some believe that the President and Congress together ought to try to work out a new method of solving these problems, a way that may be held constitutional. Our reading of the majority opinion of the Supreme Court indicates that it would be futile for Congress to try either to lay a tax which would permit paying the farmers or to do anything further about the agricultural problem. This reading may be mistaken, but in any case, is it not undignified and harmful for Congress to play hide-and-seek with the Supreme Court? The straightforward policy is for Congress not to pass any more laws on this or other major controversial matters, but rather to express all its legislative purposes in the form of proposed constitutional amendments. The fact that such amendments probably would not be ratified, if ratified at all, until after the urgency for action had brought the country to the brink of ruin, or until the situation that Congress sought to remedy had fundamentally changed, is just one of the incidentals of our glorious form of constitutionalism.

If some more flexible system of government is thought desirable, in the stress and turmoil of the modern world, we can think of no better method, compatible with preserving the Constitution and the Supreme Court, than to abandon any attempt at democratic or representative rule whatever. The Court would not, to be sure, permit dictatorship if exercised by any other agency than itself. But why not ask the Court to round out its powers by governing positively as well as negatively? The Court has never been averse from enlarging its own scope; the prerogative that it has assumed of vetoing legislation is certainly not one explicitly to be found in the words of the Constitution. Why not appeal to it on the basis of the well recognized and unassailable principle that he who exercises power ought to be responsible? Why does not Congress pass a joint resolution to the effect that since its incompetence has been so clearly demonstrated by the Court, it has no self-respecting alternative but to resign in a body, leaving the Court to govern the nation? We cannot go on with an eternal conflict between a President or a Congress saying what ought to be done, and a learned body of judges saying what cannot be done.

The task before the Court would then be simple. If labor believed that it ought to be guaranteed the right of collective bargaining, or if social insecurity seemed to demand attention, the aggrieved parties might suggest remedies, as large a variety of remedies as their ingenuity could devise. They could engage John W. Davis or James M. Beck to argue before the Court for the constitutionality of the measures favored. The opponents of these proposals could likewise present their objections through the medium of great constitutional lawyers. The Court would then have the duty of deciding, not simply what was unconstitutional, but also what the framers of the Constitution intended should be done about the difficulties of modern industrial society. For surely no present or future problem was unforeseen by Madison and the rest of the delegates in 1786, if their intentions be properly interpreted by Mr. Justice Roberts!

The President's Message

PRESIDENT Roosevelt's message to Congress was notable for at least three reasons: the dispute as to whether it was a political oration, the attack on autocracies abroad which was supplemented by simultaneous issuance of the administration proposal for neutrality, and the defiance to the New Deal's enemies at home.

On the first of these points, we are inclined to agree with the President's critics who say that this was in fact a political speech, and to ask, What of it? All presidential messages to Congress have been political in their purpose, time out of mind. The President always writes with at least one eye on the effect throughout the nation and assures both Congress and the country that things are going well under his beneficent guidance. We do not doubt that Mr. Roosevelt postponed the hour for reading the message to a time when the maximum number of listeners was available on the radio and we are aware of no reason why he should not have done so; indeed, we hope his policy may be followed by himself and other Presidents in the future. Mr. Walter Lippmann's protest that there can be no effective reply for at least forty-eight hours to a speech delivered at nine o'clock Friday night is wiped out by three facts: first, that it was only eight o'clock in the Middle West, seven in the Mountain States and six on the Pacific Coast; that the speech was available to newspaper editors some time before it was delivered, and finally, that even on the Atlantic seaboard, hostile journalists did in fact prepare effective replies which were published on Saturday morning. The problem of fair use of the radio as among proponents of various political views is one that still needs to be worked out; but it is not the answer, obviously, to prevent the President from talking to as many of his fellow citizens as care to listen.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long way toward the policy The New Republic has advocated from the beginning of the discussion. Heretofore, with the State Department's approval, he has asked wide discretionary powers to discriminate between belligerents guilty of aggression and those which are its victims. In the present state of the world such a policy would be difficult and dangerous in the extreme even if the United States were, and long had been, a full member of the League of Nations; it would be fatally unworkable as part of a national policy that in every other way looks toward the attempt at neutrality and isolation.

The bill that the President favors is so nearly identical with that of the Nye-Clark group that a compromise between the two positions should not be difficult. In general, it fills the gaps in the emergency legislation passed last year. It retains the embargo on arms and ammunition, and limits trade in all other products and commodities to the normal pre-war quantities. Even this trade may be suspended—to all belligerents—at the President's discretion. All credits to countries at war except those necessary for this normal trade are prevented. American ships shall not be used for illegal trade, and the government's protection may be withdrawn from both ships and shippers at any time. Goods sent to neutral countries for trans-shipment to a belligerent are covered. Existing treaties which conflict with the new measure would be canceled or modified. If additional countries go to war, all these provisions apply to them at once, and not, as in the temporary legislation, at the President's discretion. In the administration measure there are still some dangerous loopholes, and we hope that the congressional advocates of neutrality will see to it that they are closed; but the bill as a whole has much less in it of the former demand for extreme presidential power than anyone expected, and this change of front—for which the Hoare-Laval plan is doubtless to be thanked—is thoroughly welcome.

The President's harsh and entirely true words about autocracies were doubtless as welcome in America as they were unpopular among the rulers of Italy, Germany and Japan (the peoples of these countries were of course not permitted to learn of the President's opinion). Whether his statements were well advised depends in turn upon the question whether they expressed some fixed policy yet to be revealed or were merely a vigorous oratorical flight, like that twisting of the British lion's tail which used to be so popular among Fourth-of-July welkin-ringers. It is an ancient rule of diplomacy not to start a fight unless you are prepared to finish it. If it turns out that the President was merely writing an editorial about the superiority of democracy to tyranny, it may yet prove that he would have been wiser to leave the task to the journalists who do it so well—on dull days.

In that part of his speech that dealt with domestic affairs the President showed a sound sense of political strategy. By challenging his opponents to repeal the whole New Deal program if they dared, and to offer their own substitute for it, he carried the fighting into the enemy's camp and revealed to the country the Republicans' lack of any coherent alternative—unless one can so describe a return to Hooverism. No one expresses better than Mr. Roosevelt the aspiration of the common man for peace and freedom, and never has he done it so well as in this message. It is an ironic, if not a tragic, fact that the single concrete suggestion he brought forward was an assurance that taxes will not be increased. This was in spite of the truth which he himself not long ago pointed out, that two-thirds of the tax burden now falls upon the poor, largely in the form of city and state sales taxes. Even the assurance against increased taxation was canceled less than seventy-two hours after the message was delivered, when the President, sending the budget to Congress, warned that additional taxation would be necessary to meet any additional burden; Mr. Roosevelt knows, and so does everyone else, that an additional burden of one to two billion dollars is about to be imposed through the soldiers' bonus.

When we recall on how many previous occasions the President has uttered similar brave words; when we recall how little is the substantial achievement of his administration in the direction that these words demand; and when we remember how malignant and overwhelming is the hostility now displayed toward him by the forces of entrenched wealth and special privilege—when we recall these things we regret all the more that the President did not supplement his observations about the promised land with some definite and detailed specifications as to how he proposes to go from here to there. Nothing he can now do can rehabilitate him in the eyes of the rich; and in the long run he cannot hope to hold the masses of the people by expressions of sympathy which, no matter how brilliantly and movingly expressed, give hardly any inkling of what, after nearly three years in office, he proposes to do for them.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1936, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD R. G. TUGWELL LEWIS MUMFORD
JONATHAN MITCHELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN FIVE DOLLARS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Budget-Balancer Landon

ON JULY first of last year the American press gave birth to a Republican presidential possibility. The evening papers of that date carried headlines announcing to the world that Governor Alf Landon of Kansas had balanced his state budget. Before the week was out, former Vice President Charles Curtis and other G.O.P. wheelhorses were booming the Midwestern sensation for the presidency. Four months later New Dealer Harry Hopkins helped Landon again to attain headline status by asserting that the state of Kansas had not "put up one thin dime for work relief," and accusing the Governor of balancing his budget by "taking it out of the hides of the people." He admitted, however, that the counties and cities of the state had done well.

Governor Landon was too wise and too well advised in the ways of politics to make a public retort in self-defense, but his underlings filled the press with heated denials, pointing in refutation to the contributions of local units and a small state appropriation for relief administration. A careful sifting of the various counter-accusations reveals that the Hopkins assertions were correct in their entirety. While the local governing units of Kansas provided $7,788,628 of the $26,246,579 spent for a two-year relief program in the state, the government at Topeka put up not one red cent for work relief. The state legislature appropriated $775,000 for relief administration over an eighteen-month period, but only under protest.

Although it is true, as claimed by Landon, that article eleven of the state Constitution prohibits the voting of any extraordinary expenditure of more than $1,000,000, the same article provides that a legislative act calling for any sum exceeding that amount shall be voted on at a general election. This possibility the Governor chose to overlook, and as a result the whole burden has fallen upon the counties and cities, where it must be taken out of school and road funds or must necessitate increased tax levies on real property and additional bonded indebtedness. In most cases both alternatives have been employed, to the detriment of schools and highways, not to mention the purses of property owners and county budget-makers.

The latest gun in the controversy was fired November 13, when fifteen delegates from five Kansas labor and farmer-labor organizations presented Governor Landon with a list of ten relief-reform demands. At the same time they accused him of balancing his budget at the expense of the farmers and the unemployed. They pointed out that they, too, were gifted with horse sense, enough at least

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These representations cannot be dismissed as Democratic campaign propaganda, for included among them were vigorous indictments of such New Deal measures as the A.A.A. and the W.P.A.

Six factors played important parts in the Landon budget-balancing formula. In the first place the salaries of state employees were slashed, in some instances to a relief scale. Day laborers on the state highways, for instance, may work from eight to twelve days a month, earning thereby from $24.32 to $36.48. State prison guards receive $87 a month. Professors in state colleges are paid $140 monthly. State highway patrolmen draw $125 per month. The Governor's salary was cut to $5,000 annually.

In the next place, numbers of useless or allegedly useless jobs and departments were abolished, and state bureaus were consolidated. For example, the state hotel commissioners, fire marshals and oil inspectors saw all their jobs combined under the state department of inspection. Building and replacement programs for state institutions were abandoned, though some parts of them are badly needed. For instance, the research bureau for the state legislative council recently declared the state penitentiary at Lansing to be an insanitary firetrap. The state hospital for the insane, at Osawatomie, is so overcrowded that its officials are obliged to refuse many who are committed to its care, causing these unfortunates to be incarcerated in county jails with common criminals or returned to their homes to endanger the community. Last March, after sacrificing the state legislative building program to the desire for a balanced budget, Landon appealed fruitlessly for relief funds to erect the needed additions to these institutions.

The appropriation for the state highway department was drastically reduced after Kansas had been granted $10,000,000 of federal relief funds for road construction and repair. State bills, some owed to small merchants who can ill afford to have their money thus tied up, have been allowed to run for months, thus reducing the expenditures for the fiscal year. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the state of Kansas has voted less than $1,000,000 for relief purposes in the three years of relief operation, giving the state budget director a big advantage over similar officials in other states.

Landon's political enemies charge that his famous balanced budget is actually more a piece of political prestidigitation than a reality. They point out that Kansas is predominantly agricultural, and that the A.A.A. has been pouring money into

lessly in the red. They claim further that Landon began his term with an unexpended balance in the treasury of nearly $1,700,000 from the previous administration, which has helped him greatly. They say that federal funds have gone to an important extent to pay delinquent state taxes and that therefore it is fair to say that Kansas has been living on money from Washington. Finally, they charge that Landon has borrowed money from time to time to make the budget appear balanced when it wasn't. With the end of federal home relief, it is far from certain that even Governor Landon will be able to keep up his balanced budget until, for instance, the Republican convention next June.

Among the Governor's bitter opponents within the state are most of the public-school administrators and teachers, and the social workers who care for the state's insane, feeble-minded, indigents, etc. They charge that Governor Landon insists on keeping an archaic system under which school funds must be raised locally no matter what the local resources may be. Kansas is last among all the states of the Union in the proportion of school funds that is contributed from the state—only 1.5 percent, as compared with, for instance, 60 percent in California, 30 percent in New York, 28 percent in Maine or 24 percent in Michigan. Landon has looked on without lifting a finger while hundreds of schools have been closed and others have kept open only by cutting teachers' salaries to, in some cases, as little as $25 a month. Social workers are bitter both because Landon has appointed technically incompetent politicians to head state institutions and because he failed to come forward in support of the plan to set up a non-political Department of Public Welfare, which failed in the State Senate by one vote.

These critics point out that the state has a valuable source of revenue that is not being used, in the form of a tax on the production of gas and oil. Many other states tax such production, on the good ground that these are irreplaceable public resources, and that the government ought to get some revenue from them, to say the least. It is a coincidence, if nothing more, that in a time of deep depression, Governor Landon, himself a wealthy oil man, has made no attempt to tax such production. Oil and gas wells are taxed only as "general property" and the assessments are shockingly low. In several instances, valuations are only about as much as the annual production of a given well: 100 percent per annum seems a pretty good return on anybody's money! Perhaps this situaiton may explain why former Senator Brookhart of Iowa has publicly charged that Landon "is Standard Oil's presidential candidate."

The balancing of the budget is not the only part of his official record to which the Jayhawk Governor points with pride. In the legislative program among these are the Cash Basis Law, the Tax Limitation Law and the Budget Law. As a matter of fact, credit—if it be credit—for none of these belongs to Landon.

The Cash Basis Law provides that counties, townships and cities shall keep current yearly expenses within the yearly income. It is an excellent measure in that it prevents the local governments from piling up mountainous tax-warrant deficits. The labor of drafting and obtaining passage for this law fell not upon Landon, but entirely upon his political mentor, J. T. Moore of Pittsburg, Kansas, who, incidentally, is political boss of the state. As for the Budget Law, which requires local governments to publish their full budgets in the local newspapers, it was passed in its essential form under the administration of Landon's predecessor, Harry Woodring, now Assistant Secretary of War.

The Tax Limitation Law provides a maximum limit on all tax levies and a blanket limit on the total tax levy for political units within the state. It is a matter of record that Landon bitterly opposed this measure before it was enacted, although he is now willing to accept praise for its success.

There are legislative actions, on the other hand, which the Governor of the Sunflower State may justly claim for his own. Among them are a small graduated income tax, abolition of the poll tax, a farm-mortgage moratorium act, and a 50-percent reduction in the price of motor-car license tags. He also induced the state tax commission to order a 16 2/3-percent cut in the valuation of real property for taxing purposes. Unfortunately that saving was more than nullified in most counties by the 15 to 40 percent increases in tax levies which followed. An actual reduction in tax collections has largely been due to the ever increasing number of property owners who are letting their taxes run for the full five years allowed by law. Landon advocated but failed to obtain state ratification of the Child Labor Amendment. He failed in the effort to institute a limited inheritance tax and substitute the short ballot for the long form now in use in the state. The sales tax was another favorite that failed of legislative enactment.

Alf Landon's record as Governor of Kansas sums up about as follows: He has balanced the state budget, partly by measures of real economy but largely by penny-wise, pound-foolish measures for which the state and its citizens must pay dearly; he has obtained enactment of some beneficial legislation, but the three measures on which he rests his chief claim to greatness were the work of others.

Despite a political taciturnity reminiscent of the late Cal Coolidge, the Kansas chief executive has at one time or another expressed himself pretty fully on governmental policy. It is his avowed belief that horse sense, a policy of spending only what you have in hand, and testing by what it costs rather than whether it is needed, are the essentials

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some of the fundamental economic principles of forty years ago. In his opinion the fundamental principles guiding the writers of our Constitution were economy, frugality and common honesty, rather than the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. He once said that the iron hand of a dictator was preferable to national paralysis.

In most respects he is hostile to the New Deal, believing it to be composed of fanciful and self-indulgent dreams. None the less Landon, like Roosevelt, blames the Eastern industrial plutocracy for much of our present plight. His solution, of course, would be a return to the fundamental economic principles of forty years ago, which produced this same plutocracy, and which would mean a removal of virtually all the government's regulatory power over business.

As Governor of an agricultural state he has supported some phases of the A.A.A., but opposed the destruction of foodstuffs and the processing taxes. To replace the latter he proposes that the government should help raise the price of food by buying up finished foodstuffs from the processors, doing this in exchange for a promise on the part of those gentlemen to raise the prices they will pay the farmer. More effective agricultural tariffs and development of foreign markets are the chief measures he would see adopted by the government to aid the farm belt.

Concerning relief, Governor Landon believes that assistance to the unemployed is not privilege, vested right or charity, but rather a common obligation imposed by our rapid economic growth. As President he would balance the budget regardless of relief needs (if he dared). In all probability he would have recourse to the expedient of shifting the main financial burden upon the states while retaining federal control of the program.

In regard to banking, Landon accuses the present administration of making the Federal Reserve System a national disgrace by using it as a pawn in the game of politics. He opposes the insuring or guaranteeing of bank deposits as expensive and certain to lead to bankruptcy. It is his opinion that the destruction of national credit was more influential in causing the French and Russian revolutions than the oppression of human rights. Here he recommends a return to a "let-alone" policy.

On successive days so-called authorities on national politics have called Landon a radical and a conservative. The truth of the matter is that, while he talks liberalism, his acts are essentially conservative. Publicly he sympathizes with the impoverished farmer and the unemployed, but actually he believes in balancing the budget regardless of their needs or any other needs, and he is totally opposed to government regulation of business and banking. Like Coolidge, he regards the balancing of the budget as the only real duty of a chief

paign personality and a good face for political posters. His eyes are blue-gray, his brow broad, his chin firm, and his hair iron-gray. He is a little above medium height, broad shouldered and well built. Often called the Kansas Coolidge, he belies that title with a frequent warm smile and rapid-fire discourse on small matters. His family life is ideal. He does not drink or use profanity. His personal economy is as great as that which he practises in government. As a boy he studied law at Kansas University. He never practised law, but did try the banking game until oil called him in 1912. In that industry he has made a comfortable fortune.

His political advisers are of the smartest—former Vice President Curtis, Senator Arthur Capper and J. T. Moore. It was Moore who engineered Landon's rapid rise in Kansas politics and to whose abilities are due most of the achievements the Governor claims for his own. If Landon should win the Republican presidential nomination for 1936, you may be sure that his success will in large measure be owed to the advice of the Kansas politician who has reigned supreme in that state for twenty years without allowing more than ten percent of the voters even to learn of his existence. Moore is certainly a strong character; Landon has yet to prove whether he is or isn't. Many Kansans are repeating a local tradition to the effect that "Topeka," in the language of the early Kansas Indian tribes, means "the place the small potatoes come from." So far Landon of Topeka has been small potatoes, but he still has a good chance to grow.

MORTON TAYLOR.

*(This is the first of a series of articles discussing various possible Republican presidential nominees. The second, dealing with Senator Borah, will appear in the near future.—*THE EDITORS.*)*

Autumnal Migration

Out of the northlands the wild geese are flying,
Out of Ontario, Maine, Saskatchewan,
Their long necks stretched, the honking and the crying,
The sudden flapping and the following on. . . .
I have seen them, caught by the northwind's arms,
Quickly twist their necks, recede and ride
Like paper bags upon the powerful air.
Faces I thought of as I watched them there,
Gestures I thought of as I saw them glide.

Again they come; now blowing over farms,
Over lakes, over transparent waters,
Their long necks stretched, dark green and speckled blue.
(Who is that woman; her indolent stare?)
But no, the geese now, not a face I knew;
Here now the long migration (not the mouth),
Here now the cold nights (not the yellow hair),
Here now the geese flying toward the south

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Germany Does to the Jews

A handful of force is better than a sackful of justice.

—Deutsche Justiz, official organ of the German Bar, 1935.

FROM THE very beginning of the Nazi movement, its leaders have stressed anti-Semitism as a prime element of their policy. The program of the National Socialist Party, adopted February 25, 1920, laid down the principle:

None but a member of the nation *(Volksgenosse)* can be a citizen of the State *(Staatsburger)*. None but those of German blood, whatever their creed, can be members of the nation. Therefore, no Jew can be a member of the nation.

Despite the anti-Semitic agitation from the inception of the Nazi movement, such demands for the denial of equal rights were not, in the main, taken seriously by the German Jews. It was difficult for them to conceive that the successive measures which, from the middle of the nineteenth century, had abolished the ghetto and established their equality as German citizens, would ever be nullified. Most of them had lived for generations in Germany, and the majority were almost completely assimilated. The Jews believed in the German Constitution and German justice. Their attitude is well illustrated by the story of the Russian Jew who, during the massacres of the Kishinev pogrom, wanted to telephone to Kaiser Wilhelm, because he was certain he could obtain help from him, so great was the Jews' faith in German law.

The Nazis, having come to power on January 30, 1933, at first announced that there would be no general onslaught on the rights of the Jews. Even after the Reichstag fire, February 28, 1933, Goering announced that "If the Jews behave, are loyal and mind their own affairs, they have nothing to fear. But we don't want them at the helm of the nation, and will not tolerate them there." Hitler's vice-chancellor, von Papen, speaking for the government, said on March 7: "Every Jewish citizen who fulfills the duties of citizenship may be assured of equal treatment by the State authorities."

Notwithstanding these official assurances, in the earliest months of the Nazi regime there were numerous acts illegally depriving the Jews of their public offices. Jewish professors and teachers, Jewish judges and lawyers were removed from their posts with greater or less violence; Jewish doctors and dentists were hindered in the practice of their professions. In addition there was the so-called coordinating of all organizations, *i.e.*, the expulsion of Jews and Marxists from various groups, from the anti-Jewish drive, it occasioned no surprise

During the month of April, 1933, the first "laws" against the Jews were issued. Actually these were only government decrees, but since the Constitution was altered, they were called laws. They "legalized" the already accomplished illegal acts against the Jews. The law of April 7, 1933, for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, ordered their expulsion from the civil service unless they had entered it before the War, or had fought, or had lost fathers or sons on the field of battle. The exceptions were seldom honored in practice. The "Aryan paragraph" was gradually extended to all branches of public life, regardless of the achievements of Jews as public servants, scientists, jurists, teachers or doctors. Even cultural activities were "coördinated" by a Reich Chamber of Culture *(Reichskulturkammer)* by a law of September 22, 1935.

Under such conditions, about one hundred thousand Jews fled the Third Reich. Some five hundred and fifty thousand remained, in the belief that the worst was over and in the hope that gradually the anti-Semitic agitation would cease or at least its official sanction would be removed.

Their hopes were groundless. In July, 1935, a new and fiercer anti-Semitic campaign was launched. By this time the Nazis, more than ever before, needed to divert the attention of the masses from their increasingly desperate economic plight. Again the Jew was made the scapegoat.

The plans of the "radical" Nazis, who are led by Rosenberg and Streicher, were disclosed by the pogroms that the Nazis themselves staged in Berlin last July. Rosenberg declared: "We shall never compromise in carrying out our program." Streicher demanded no more and no less than the sterilization of all Jews. Five hundred German doctors followed in his steps and demanded "as doctors of German descent" a law providing that Aryan women who have sexual relations with Jews should be deprived of their citizenship, interned in a labor camp and sterilized. This decision was characterized by a Bavarian newspaper as a courageous act. The crudeness of the anti-Jewish agitation is indicated by a sign that was placed on a Bavarian road whose almost right-angle curve was especially dangerous to motorists. The sign reads: "Warning! Very dangerous curve. Jews may go 120 kilometers an hour." A sign found in Hanover read: "We drink Jewish blood like beer!"

Though it was known that important elements in Nazi councils were opposed to the resumption of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

complete expulsion of the Jews. This victory resulted in Hitler's manifesto of September 11, 1935, proclaiming that the National Socialist state regards as its sworn foes "Jewish Marxism and parliamentary democracy, which is related to it," and "certain stupid and reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie." The manifesto was followed by the anti-Jewish laws of September, 1935, which may be summarized under several headings:

Annulment of Citizenship. By the first law even those Jews whose families have lived in Germany for generations have been robbed of their citizenship. They have been relegated to a special, subordinate status as "state members" *(Staatsangehörige).* As such they have no political rights whatever. Only those of German or "racially related" blood who have proved themselves loyal to the Reich and the people can be citizens.

Freedom of Movement. This previously unquestioned right of every German citizen has from the advent of the Nazi regime been denied to the Jews. The Nazi press time and again has triumphantly announced that this or that county, district, city or locality "is now free of Jews." Goering's Essener Nationalzeitung writes: "There is not a Jew left in the cattle market at Husum. The mere half-dozen survivors are really not important." Throughout the land one comes across such signs as: "Jews not wanted," "No Jews served here," "Jews and dogs not admitted," "Beware of Jews and pickpockets." "No admission" signs, at first employed by hotels and inns, have been extended to bathhouses, museums, theaters, even to villages, cities and whole districts.

Property Ownership. In many sections of Germany the Jews are barred from owning or even renting real estate. Jews were compelled, by boycott or threat of force, to sell "voluntarily" business holdings of all kinds, *i.e.,* to dispose of their properties to Aryans for a song. We need only name the great newspaper and book-publishing houses, Ullstein and Mosse, not to mention thousands of smaller concerns. State Secretary Walter Frank stated "that newspaper ownership would be limited in the future to Reich citizens" (The New York Times, October 30, 1935). Finding life intolerable, especially in the provincial towns, and fleeing to the larger cities, Jews have been denied the right to change their residence.

Jews and the Flag. By the second law the swastika, which Goering calls "the anti-Jewish symbol of the world," has been made the national emblem. Jews are forbidden to display this flag. They may express what patriotism remains among them by displaying the white and blue of Zionism. Incidentally, the adoption of the swastika was a slap in the face for the monarchists. These gentlemen never, during the Weimar Republic, resigned themselves to the loss of the imperial black, white and red. They were gladdened by its restoration.

the Third Reich, and given a blow to the foundations of the Nazi dictatorship.

"German Blood and Honor." The third law declares that "the purity of German blood is the condition of the permanency of the German people." It is therefore decreed: (1) Marriage between Jews and those of German or racially related blood is forbidden under penalty of imprisonment at hard labor. Marriages in violation of this provision, even if concluded abroad, are invalid as circumventing the law. (2) Extra-marital relations between these persons are forbidden under penalty of imprisonment in a penitentiary or at hard labor. (3) Jews are forbidden to employ female German servants less than forty-five years of age under penalty of imprisonment for one year, or fine, or both.

The first judicial decisions under the September "purity" law will be of importance not only in Germany but abroad as well. It may be inferred that marriages between German Jews and nationals of other Aryan countries will hereafter have no validity in the Third Reich.

Segregation. The September decrees also establish separate schools for Jewish children. The editor of the Berlin Judenkenner, a journal which almost surpasses Streicher's Stürmer in its anti-Semitic venom, can now rejoice: he will no longer see the Aryan Fritz and Hans in the same classroom with "a Moses or a Sarah."

Anti-Religious Measures. In the early days of their power the Nazis contented themselves with the violation of temples and cemeteries and with transforming synagogues into Nazi clubs. In August, 1935, the Judenkenner launched a campaign to prohibit the teaching of Hebrew doctrine. "In reality," he wrote, "one cannot speak of a Jewish religion at all; for, according to the German conception, the doctrine found in the Jewish Books of the Law is not religion. Our program requires that Jewish doctrine be forbidden, the synagogues destroyed; the propagation of the Jewish law must be punished by death."

An outcast in the land of his birth, the German Jew today lives in a veritable ghetto. If he was in the service of the state, he has been dismissed. If he was a member of the liberal professions, his privileges have been taken, his practice ruined. If he was an artisan he has been cast out of the guild and goes begging for a master. If he is a worker of hand or brain he is denied admission to the Labor Front and thus can hardly find a day's work. If he is a student he is segregated, Jim-Crowed, denied accommodation altogether. Attempts to turn to agriculture are not permitted. Jewish agricultural schools have been closed. Even trade is no longer fully open to the German Jew. Not only will no good German traffic with him, but a recent decree forbids renewal of the licenses of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lations define the extent to which Jews are to be permitted to engage in every economic activity. Herr Hitler has already warned that should this administrative process fail of "satisfactory" results, the "Jewish question" will be entirely "turned over" to the Nazi Party. It is not difficult to surmise what this will mean.

Only where the Jew is indispensable do the Nazis still tolerate him. Dr. Theodor Lewald, for example, a gentleman of mixed Aryan and Jewish origin, continues as president of the Olympic Games Committee. Doubtless he will last no longer than is necessary to fulfill his task of making sure the Olympic Games are held in Germany. Perhaps, too, under the protecting wings of Dr. Schacht there is still to be found a man of Jewish descent. And it is not impossible that the army itself hides an officer who has not yet been dismissed for the sin of having a Jewish grandmother. One privilege only has been left to the German Jew: that of serving in the army of his Nazi benefactors, of entering the Labor Battalions, and, one day perhaps, dying for the glory of the Third Reich.

An apparent anomaly is found in the Nazis' not disinterested tolerance of certain Jewish moneyed interests. The financial plight of the Third Reich has given Hitler endless worry. It is not surprising, therefore, that in August, 1935, at a time of the most intense anti-Semitic agitation, the names of the following Jewish bankers appeared on the prospectus of a loan sought by the German railroads: S. Bleichroeder, Mendelssohn and Company, J. Dreyfuss and Company, Arnhold Brothers, Simon Hirschland, Veit L. Homburger, A. Levy, E. Heymann, Jacob S. H. Stern, L. Berends and Sons, M. Warburg and Anton Kohn.

Meanwhile, the German people are gradually awakening from the Hitler hypnosis. They no longer display the enthusiasm for the Nazis that was so marked two years ago. Events are disproving the incessant cry that the ills of the Fatherland flow from the Jewish question. In many quarters a furtive sympathy exists for the suffering Jews. The masters of the Third Reich, confronted with the gravest economic and political problems, devote themselves to "racial purification." And while Dr. Schacht trembles at the increasing financial chaos, the inexorable economic forces, in alliance with the anti-Nazi front from Catholic to Communist, drive toward a solution that will finally settle the fate not only of the German Jews but of the entire German people.

DR. KURT ROSENFELD.

Congress and the Gag Laws

WITH SOME fifty-odd bills affecting civil liberties before it, the new session of Congress will find itself in a ticklish situation from now on. The legislative path looms long and treacherous and a misstep might prove serious for the New Deal, if Mr. Roosevelt still wants liberals' support.

Chief among its headaches will be the Kramer Sedition Bill (H.R. 6427). This measure, the most prominent recommendation of the recent congressional committee investigating un-American activities, was favorably reported by the House Judiciary Committee in the closing days of the last session by the significant vote of thirteen to twelve, after the subcommittee which conducted hearings on it had disapproved it. The bill has been condensed into a single devastating sentence: "That any person who knowingly and willfully shall advocate the overthrow of the government of the United States by force or violence shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for more than five years, or both."

The passage of this measure, which is condemned by both the liberal and conservative press, would serve admirably as a focal point for a liberal attack. After all, there are still some Americans who remember how the infamous Alien and Sedition laws of 1798, which the Kramer Bill strongly resembles, caused an enraged people to rise and drive from power in 1800 the party guilty of passing them.

Second in importance to the Kramer Bill, and with the outrages perpetrated in the name of its own historical forbear, the "Espionage Act," still fresh in the minds of most, is the Tydings-McCormack Disaffection Bill (S. 2253). This measure would punish by two years' imprisonment or a $1,000 fine or both, anyone who "with intent to incite disaffection, advises, counsels, urges or solicits any members of the army and navy to disobey the laws or regulations governing the army and navy," etc. This bill is perhaps stronger than the war-time act upon which it is based, and would enact into our daily laws a measure whose existence in 1917 was defended only as a war necessity. It was in its fair name that Rose Pastor Stokes was sentenced to ten years in the federal penitentiary for saying: "I am for the people and the government is for the profiteers"; that Eugene V. Debs received ten years for telling a convention of Socialists that he abhorred war; that an ex-British soldier got twenty years for saying ". . . that the soldiers were giving their lives for the capitalists, that 40 percent of the ammunition of the Allies or their guns was defective because of graft"; and that some two thousand other arrests were made.

The present bill is now awaiting action in the House after having slipped through th...

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the consent calendar when nobody was watching for it. Its House companion bill had been introduced earlier and was stopped in committee by a group organized by the American Civil Liberties Union, consisting of Dr. Charles A. Beard, Representative Vito Marcantonio, Professor Chafee of Harvard, Professor Llewellyn of Columbia and a number of other prominent liberals. The fact that the Senate had passed the bill, however, forced it out of committee and onto the House calendar, but not until it was entirely raked fore and aft by a blistering minority report by Maverick and Kvale, which characterized it as "a brash piece of Hitleristic fascism."

Observing every time-honored aspect of gag-law tradition, Congress has paralleled its drive on the home-grown dissenters with a campaign of unprecedented severity against the alien. Of the fifteen bills tending to facilitate deportations and raise even higher the barriers against entry, a number are sufficiently dangerous to merit concern. Two of these have been favorably reported by the House Immigration Committee and are now awaiting action.

The most violent is one (H.R. 7120) introduced by Mr. Dies, who has recently announced that he is going to press vigorously for its passage. The bill provides for the immediate deportation of all Fascists and Communists. No distinction is made between the two and their mutual object is established as the overthrow of government by force and violence. This advocacy need not be directed at the United States alone, the bill further provides. Should an alien Fascist or Communist advocate the overthrow of any government *except a Fascist or Communist government* he is to be deported.

Mr. Dickstein, who, among other things, promises to fight for the establishment of another committee to continue the work of the McCormack committee, also had a bill (H.R. 7221) that would completely insulate the American mind from "propaganda instigated from foreign sources," which is defined as any systematic effort intended to gain within the United States favorable public opinion for the adoption of any opinion, or course of action, etc., inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution, or the extension from any foreign country to the United States of the application of religious or racial prejudices and intolerances.

But the alien is not entirely friendless. A number of bills have been introduced which, if enacted, would do much to ease his lot. Foremost among these is the official bill of the Department of Labor (H.R. 8163), which would temper some of the more stringent mandatory provisions of the Immigration Laws and give the Bureau some degree of discretion where they now have none in dealing with cases of unusual hardship as, for example, where families with native-born children would be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York, has introduced another progressive bill (H.R. 8384) sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union to reëstablish the boasted tradition of America as a land of asylum for refugees from old-world tyrannies by lifting the bars against aliens, otherwise admissible, who are refugees from their country of origin for political, racial or religious reasons. Rarely in world history has there been a greater need for such legislation.

The last important group of bills awaiting action are the censorship bills dealing with the perennial problems of birth control, control of the air and the transmission of radical literature through the mails. As with the laws about aliens, bills have been introduced that are both progressive and repressive. The American Civil Liberties Union has taken the initiative in sponsoring a number of bills introduced by Mr. Scott to clear up the problem of radio control. Three bills (H.R. 9229-31) would deprive the Communications Commission of censorship powers and relieve radio stations from liability for remarks made in any broadcasts on public, social, political or economic issues; would compel radio stations to set aside regular periods for uncensored discussion of social problems with an equal opportunity for both sides of a controversial issue to expound their points of view; and would compel all radio stations to keep accurate records of rejected applications for time and the reasons therefor.

On the other side of the censorship fence there is a group of bills designed to "protect" American morals, opinions and religious beliefs. A bill introduced by Mr. Culkin (H.R. 2999) would establish a federal censorship of motion pictures over and above existing state boards. One introduced by Mr. Higgins (H.R. 5370) would add an interesting chapter to our laws by punishing the receiver of birth-control information as well as the sender.

Mr. McCormack (the same Mr. McCormack) is represented in this group by a bill (H.R. 8623) that would require foreign propagandists to register with the Secretary of State and reveal their compensation. Another bill (S. 3261), aimed to accomplish the same result, has been introduced by Mr. Walsh in the Senate and Mr. McKeough in the House. These measures provide for the censorship by the State Department of radio addresses of representatives of foreign governments. Mr. Moritz has introduced a bill (H.R. 8808) providing that every editorial sent through the mails must bear the signature of the writer. Last among these measures, and not least in importance, is a bill (S. 3259) introduced in the Senate by Messrs. Clark and Nye that provides that all public statements, oral or written, of officers of the military forces shall be submitted to the Secretary of War or of the Navy for their approval, with a penalty of

The Student Union Begins

SO VAST have been the changes wrought in American undergraduate life that their full meaning is often obscured. Nothing new is revealed in the discovery that students, as one exhaustive survey has shown, are "more alert to social issues" than were their predecessors. Neither is it adequate to regard sporadic murmurings, protests, even strikes as ends in themselves. The insurgence must achieve scope and purpose; it must be based upon real issues, fears and incentives; it must have some plain relation to and bearing on the outside world. Encouraging evidence that this maturity—in aim, numbers and influence—is being attained was furnished by the Christmas conventions of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the National Student League, and the ensuing conference of these groups and others which established the American Student Union.

The setting in which the unity session was held dramatically reënforced its purpose. Less than a week before the delegates were to assemble, President George Rightmire of Ohio State University banned the congress from the Columbus campus. He blamed this abrupt move on a "coal shortage," refusing, however, to alter his decision when the convention offered to pay full operating expenses. It is noteworthy that just twenty-four hours later the Sunday editions of the Hearst press published a bitter indictment of the proposed Union, tracing its origin to the doors of the Kremlin.

When the scene of the convention was shifted to the Columbus Y.W.C.A. "under a purely business arrangement," the patrioteers became still more articulate. Even as the N.S.L. and the S.L.I.D. were convening separately to act on the proposal for amalgamation, the American Legion issued its first manifesto, demanding that the "Y" eject the conference.

That afternoon one Arthur Barrows, a former captain of the R.O.T.C. at Ohio State, snatched the roster of the convention and ran off with it. Another law-abiding citizen, representing the Ohio State "Americaneers," was found to have entered the conference on forged credentials. So contagious was this atmosphere of patriotism that one Legion official bluntly boasted to a student reporter that federal agents were present at the convention "to get the real stuff." Despite the crudity of the patrioteers' performance, their influence over the community was large. Although the convention was not exiled from the "Y," it is safe to predict that no such gathering will be held there soon again.

These circumstances helped to solidify the Union convention, to which nearly 500 delegates had come from schools and colleges throughout the nation. About half of this number were not affiliated with either of the two national organizations. Many came from local liberal clubs, religious societies, were participating in such a conference for the first time in their lives. The fact of their presence was an important indication of what has happened on the American campus during these years of crisis. I know that several of the delegates had been participating in vigilante attacks less than a year ago; others had, until recently, resisted the intrusion of "outside issues" into the university; still a third group has just deserted the ivory-towerites.

It would be untrue to report that this was a complete cross-section of the American campus, but it did represent those dynamic, alive centers within the university which today embrace literally thousands of students. So bankrupt is orthodox academic thought that these students are in search of more coherent leadership. They are frankly terrified by the future. They are genuinely determined to do something about it. These fresh recruits did not retreat, for example, from the idea of an anti-war strike—a gesture that would have been unthinkable for most of them three years ago. Neither were they frightened at the prospect of joining hands with radicals, despite abundant advice from the authorities against the link.

It should be emphasized, of course, that the non-radicals were not alone in effecting a transformation. Nothing did more to strengthen the Union and guarantee its existence than the efforts of the Socialists and Communists. They had united among themselves, abandoning that bitter strife which has wrecked so many previous congresses; the delegates were not met by a complex, heavy-laden, stereotyped formula or an involved series of resolutions to be accepted between yawns. A program was adopted which kept the essence of a militant position without its bewildering, minute accompaniments. It calls for organized defense of academic freedom; it pledges opposition to the war preparations of the United States government and its campus instrument, the R.O.T.C.; citing the inadequacy of the National Youth Administration, it urges extended government relief and increased educational facilities; it opposes racial discrimination; finally, it calls for alliance with labor in the realization of common aims. These are familiar issues. It is unprecedented, however, to witness so divergent and representative a body acknowledging such problems as a mutual possession, rather than as the exclusive concern of the radicals.

The vast majority of these students are new to any insurgent movement. They do not harbor the deep-rooted hatreds that are the tragic heritage of present liberal-radical groups in this country. They cannot be kept apart by references to an intense theoretical dispute of the nineteenth century. They do sense keenly the approaching storm of American fascism which is so plainly reflected on the campus. The Student Union is founded upon the conviction that opposition to fascism must be the first point on the agenda of every progressive, decent sector of American life. If the Union is able to demonstrate

LICENSED TO AGENDA INC. ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

picion and distrust, without constant disputes over various shades of Utopia, it will have served a supremely important purpose.

JAMES WECHSLER.

Route 61

ALL THE time he was loading Louella's little box and the wicker basket with Louella's cat in it and the lunch Mrs. Johnson had packed for him and for Louella, and while he was testing the tires and shaking his head over the patched-up spare, and all the time he was trying not to think, Jim Johnson felt his sister-in-law had not finished speaking. And he tried to look very busy, concentrated, lifting up the hood and examining the feed line that so often broke, again punching the spare tire, trying out the headlights, jiggling the bumpers to see if they were loose—anything, anything so she would not again start forever talking. He wanted to be already away, out of the house for good, he and Louella riding in the night, alone together, quiet, the car filled with all the possessions in the world that he and Louella owned, Louella sleeping in the lie-down place Mrs. Johnson had fixed on the rear seat, Louella wanting water—she was so often thirsty—he and Louella having the midnight lunch. The goal, the final arrival in the morning, what they would finally find—he refused to think. He wanted to call:

"Louella, did you finish supper?

"Louella, come on.

"Are you ready?"

He wanted—for a wild moment—to snatch the child out of the Johnson kitchen, carry her off to the car—and jumping in, to throw the switch, the car into gear and off. He wanted. . . . He was grateful when his fat brother, slowly, placidly came out into the lighted doorway and said, a road map in his hand:

"I guess there ain't no way of missing going through St. Paul. You'll have to take your chances and go in Arcade Street, and then you'll drive a little way on Seventy-seventh Street, then you'll get back on Route 61 on Hastings Avenue. I guess maybe at night it won't be so crowded."

Jim Johnson became very interested in Route 61 and wanted to go back inside the house and argue it out with Oscar. But Mrs. Johnson's asthma-wheeze like a clock getting ready to strike stopped him, and he bent to the car as if to ward off words. Mrs. Johnson gasping said:

"The poor child—if she was one of my own I wouldn't let her go out riding in the night to catch her death. What sort of mother can that woman be? Ain't she got no shame? Don't she feel no kinship with her own flesh and blood, running off like that? Is she a wife of yours, or ain't she a wife?"

She stopped a moment to loosen her strangling

"I guess you'd better not count getting there much before ten o'clock in the morning. Maybe there'll be some dust. I guess that will slow you up a little. I guess you'd better not take any chances if there's a lot of dust."

Inside Louella was quarreling with the Johnson kids as if she were not leaving the Johnson home for good. Mrs. Johnson's voice was clearer:

"I put on her every bit of clothes I could spare from my own. She's the cutest thing. She smiled at me just as bold, and she said: 'I'm going to my mummy.' It just tore my insides to hear her talk like that."

Oscar Johnson said:

"After you leave St. Paul you go right on with Route 61. You'll hit the Mississippi River about three in the morning. I guess you won't see it though, at night. And maybe it's too far to see anyway. Especially with all the dust around."

Inside the car the cat went scratch-scratch trying to get out of the wicker basket, and Jim Johnson put his hand inside, and the cat somehow got through with his paw and clawed him sharply. The pain was like an electric shock and Jim put his finger in his mouth, sucked at it. Mrs. Johnson said:

"If she won't come back you get the law on her. You go to the police and you tell them everything. I guess they're used to handling that kind of mother too. You tell her I said she's worse than the lowest kind of beast, because they at least take care of their own."

From behind Oscar came Louella's little scream and she ran into his legs, wheeled around them, ran out into the darkening yard, to the car and yelled:

"I guess Tiger's my own cat."

"No, it ain't," yelled the Johnson kids. "You leave our cat behind."

Mrs. Johnson caught both her little sons, held them back, to her. Oscar Johnson said:

"I guess you'd better have it greased too, when you get to Askov. It pays in the end. You keep your car greased and it won't give you no trouble."

"You leave our cat behind," yelled the Johnson kids struggling from their mother.

"I won't," Louella yelled back.

She must have climbed inside the car because the door was shut. Oscar Johnson stood in the doorway of the house lighted from behind. Mrs. Johnson wept and held on to her sons. The cat desperately was trying to get out. Jim Johnson got inside the car, banged shut the door, tried out the shift, stepped on the starter, and eased the car out of the Johnson yard. There wasn't very much dust. He heard Louella fumble with the basket and said:

"Don't open it. He'll jump out and he'll run away."

He heard Louella rise, and suddenly felt her warm breath on the back of his neck. She threw her arms around him, hugged him, and they rode out of the lane, to the right, across the railroad track, ditches on both sides of the narrow road,

NATHAN ASCH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

A Congress of Artful Dodgers—Relief and Neutrality Can't Be Sidestepped—A Revised Lundeen Bill

THERE is little disposition at the present session of Congress to wrestle with real issues. Just before an election, the classic rule of politicians is: "Conciliate your enemies; your friends will vote for you anyway." There will be plenty of accusatory jaw-wagging by Republicans and Democrats during the next few weeks, but on any issue remotely concerned with the allocation of economic control in this country the silence will be profound. The aim of administration leaders will be to appear as conservative as possible, in the hope of snaring independent Republican votes. Already you can hear Representative Buchanan, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and one of the Democratic high command, lecturing on the beauties of economy and an almost-balanced budget in the exact phrases of the Liberty League. On the other side, the Republicans are preparing to pass themselves off as New Dealers, especially where favors to the farm vote are concerned.

Relief and neutrality are the sole issues of any long-range meaning likely to be debated in this session. The chance of other serious issues coming before Congress depends on action by organized labor. A strike of longshoremen and seamen is gathering shape on the West Coast, but probably it will have direct effects on too few states to gain the undivided attention of Congress. However, a conflict in one of the mass industries might change the temper of Congress overnight. One such conflict, in the coal industry, is an imminent possibility. The exact date when the Guffey coal-control act will come before the Supreme Court for decision is still uncertain. But there is nothing uncertain about the determination of John L. Lewis and his miners not to have the industry tossed back into the quicksands of price and wage cutting from which it was hauled by the N.R.A. If the Guffey act is declared void, some of Lewis' advisers, at least, will urge him to demand the immediate nationalization of coal properties—a step to which the United Mine Workers is already committed in principle—and to back up his demand with the threat of a strike, the only weapon that the miners possess. This issue of coal, affecting half a million of the best organized workers in the country, lies just under the surface of things here in Washington and has explosive potentialities.

Both the administration and the Republicans would like to dodge the issue of a permanent relief system until after the election. The old P.W.A. is considered reasonably impeccable, but the Republicans profess to be eager for a congressional investigation into the contracts let by other relief agencies. During the next few weeks, they will make charges of extravagance and outright graft, but they have not the vote to force a full-dress inquiry unless they can bring evidence to show that the graft is of a graver character than most observers now believe. The latter is what both Democrats and Republicans appear to be afraid to face. If there is any intelligent discussion of the unemployed problem at the present session, it will probably be due to Senator Wagner's housing bill, a measure of the first importance. Wagner's object is to provide employment and low-cost housing, but the bill has far wider implications. In effect, it says that when a vital industry, such as building, is unable to produce goods at a price that consumers can afford, the government is entitled to intervene, and to operate part or all of the industry in the interest of the country. This is a principle that has an obvious application to coal mining and to railroads.

How much support the housing bill will receive will depend on Wagner's willingness to put pressure on the administration. Personally devoted to Mr. Roosevelt, Wagner has more perseverance and consistency than the President. Where Mr. Roosevelt has pursued a zigzag course, Wagner has kept firmly to the line represented by the National Labor Act and the Social Security Act, for both of which he was largely responsible. Since he was born in Germany, Wagner is debarred from presidential ambitions. Unless he should eventually be appointed to the Supreme Court, he has now gone as high in politics as he can. Because he is acceptable to all Democratic factions in New York, and has the sentimental advantage among Tammany leaders of having been a protege of Boss Murphy, his Senate seat is safe for at least another term. Only the extremely aged among the Senators, like Glass and Norris, are as free from motives to play personal politics.

Mandatory neutrality legislation appears assured. No later than last August, Mr. Roosevelt told a group of Congressmen that he would never consent to a mandatory law, and challenged them to a fight. He has now completely reversed his position. He seems prepared to yield even on the clause in the administration bill permitting him to choose the moment when raw-material embargoes should be imposed. In one stroke, he has transformed Nye, Bone and Clark in the Senate, and Maverick in the House, from potentially embarrassing critics into temporarily enthusiastic supporters. Further on in the session, another peace issue will arise with the army and navy appropriation bills. Senator Harrison announced a few days ago that the administration will ask for immediate and large increases in the army and navy air forces. This can only mean that we shall have a military air race with Japan added to the naval race that is likely to result from the London conference. It seems foolish, at the same session, to take elaborate steps to keep out of war in Europe while taking expensive means to get into war in the Far East. The advantages, to ordinary citizens, of dying in Asia rather than Europe seem infinitesimal.

The new Farmer-Labor Senator, Elmer A. Benson, appointed to the vacancy left by the death of Senator Schall, has made an excellent impression here. He is young, just turned forty, a former bank clerk, and recently Minnesota Banking Commissioner. He comes admittedly as

LICENSED FOR PERSONAL USE ONLY
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at least partially dependent, politically, upon the administration. Benson and his fellow Farmer-Laborite, Shipstead, can best afford to criticize the administration from a left-wing point of view.

The chief legislative measure of the congressional left-wing bloc will be a revised form of the Lundeen social-insurance bill, which will be sponsored in the Senate by Frazier of North Dakota. Like last year's Lundeen bill, it is the work of a group of experts headed by Miss Mary van Kleeck, and is technically admirable. It proposes an immediate appropriation of $5,000,000,000 to be distributed in various forms of insurance under the supervision of workers' committees. After the first year, funds would be provided by taxes on incomes, corporate surpluses and other forms of accumulated wealth. A gentle campaign has been begun by left-wingers to convert the thirty-nine acknowledged Townsendites in the House.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

The Dear Dead Days Beyond Recall—Forgive and Forget—Where Are the Banks of Yesteryear?

LIKE Charles Lamb, I cannot bring myself to throw out old books. They hang on and molder and clutter up the shelves. It is difficult to put out the old magazines. But here one must be firm, for they pile up so swiftly that the choice is finally between getting rid of the magazines or abandoning my own study. At this time of the year, therefore, I find myself thumbing over old copies trying to decide which ones should go to the scrapheap. And this I cannot do without rambling through the pages. Here always is history—history so recent, yet as much a part of the solid past as Tacitus. There is something fascinating about these essays and, above all, the advertisements, which seem so much a part of the present and yet are so very ancient. I had just been reading a very warm, pulsating piece of patriotic eloquence in my morning paper from a public-utility spokesman. He affected a broad, generous attitude toward utility enemies. After all, they were for doing something to the utilities. Perhaps the utilities might meet them—not halfway of course, but a few steps—and submit gracefully to some amiable but harmless gestures of control. The big thing for everybody was to get rid of the emotional stir generated by brooding over the natural human mistakes of the last decade. After all, everybody made mistakes. The great thing was to forget. This was fresh in my mind as I ran through some of these old magazines—papyrus found in the ruins of that remote age under Herbert Hoover.

It would be a pleasant and, above all, a profitable thing if the people could just be brought to forget it all. But why forget it? For instance, running hastily over the advertising pages of one of our leading journals—now, alas! no more, itself caught and crushed in the crack-up of that very system it so busily boosted—I found the ads of all those magic volumes. "How to Get Ahead Financially" Market" and so on. In other magazines I read "He made $70,000 after reading 'Beating the Stock Market.' You can do the same." "Consolidated Gas—Will it go to $250?" This was in May, 1929. I don't recall what it went to—far from $250. But I recall it got down at one time in 1935 to 15⅞. Now the point to all this is that one now sees the same kind of ads cropping up again. The Bourbon who is famed for forgetting nothing asks his victims to forget everything.

Here is the dear old Cities Service in 1929 announcing that 100,000 bought Cities Service securities that year. Now what Wall Street needs is these 100,000 skulls washed clean of everything save the ability to read and write and guide the pen upon the dotted line.

Here is one that made me pause. "In these high-pressure days you must make every minute pay." Bang! You can almost see the ebullient Charles Mitchell foaming over as he drove that point into the consciousness of his salesmen. "A man needs sound advice for investment decision." Where to go for it? Where but to that extraordinary institution with its offices in fifty American cities and its 11,000 miles of private wires, always hot with inside dope and investment wisdom. The National City Company—now no more.

But best of all was this touching gem. Here was a pen-and-ink drawing—Mrs. B., looking a little bewildered, sitting timidly opposite the desk of the masterful Mr. G. Mr. G.'s name is given in full and his photograph. He was a banker—perhaps still is. The heading of the ad is "Mr. G. tells how he helped a widow to financial independence." Then follows Mr. G.'s story: "Mrs. B's case was typical. She was a widow. We all know that widows who have been left sums of money in life insurance are particularly good prey for fake stock promoters and high-pressure speculation salesmen.

"Mrs. B. came to me one day and said: 'Mr. G., how can I invest $8,000 from my husband's life insurance? I can live on my present earnings and I want to invest this surplus for the future.'" And so on. Of course, Mr. G. told her what to do. You will be eager to know for whose benefit Mr. G. is retailing this experience and where all this heads up. This was an S. W. Straus ad.

There is plenty more to the same effect in these forgotten periodicals now over five years old. There are the names of companies no longer in existence, banks that owe millions to the R.F.C., banking houses that are extinct, endorsements from business men whose interest these last few years has been not in investment bonds but in bail bonds. But the great point, dear readers, is that you must forget all this. Put it all down to human weakness. Do not remember it even for the purpose of learning lessons.

Some of these advertisements are of an entirely different type. For instance there was a full-page ad by the American Water Works and Electric Company. It seems to me I have been hearing lately much of the unspeakable crime of government interfering in the affairs of business, particularly the affairs of utility companies. May the government let us alone is the prayer now. But in 1928 the American Water Works and Electric Company recalled that a "despotic king once taxed the windows and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to all people of such basic needs as light, water and energy *upon terms just, both to the producer and the customer.*

"This is wise regulation.

"Nothing has contributed more to the usefulness and stability of our subsidiaries in the sixteen states where they operate than the *protection given by this assurance of fair pay in return for good service."*

So government interference, it seems, is all right so long as it guarantees "fair pay"! And this very government interference we are assured, is the most important element in the stability and usefulness of "our subsidiaries."

One morsel I cannot leave out—just a slip, an ill considered trope by a 1928 writer who did not pause to examine the past or present and who looked not into the future. "Family life in America," he said, "is no more. People are always moving their homes. When you look for someone after a period of six months no trace can be found of him. *The only permanent addresses are the banks."*

But, come! come! This is a pleasant season and a new day. Let us forget everything. JOHN T. FLYNN.

On the Labor Front

Boring from Within by Big Business?—Mr. Ridder, Relief Administrator and Publisher— A Report from Pittsburgh

IT WOULD be interesting to know to what extent, if any, the bungling and inefficiency that have distinguished the W.P.A. program can be blamed on a subtle kind of sabotage from within. Could it be possible that there might be men in key positions who, though they would not for a moment think of deliberately wrecking the program, would at the same time not be greatly saddened by its failure? I have in mind, specifically, business men who by training and inclination are militantly opposed to the labor policy of the Roosevelt administration (mildly pro-labor as it has been) and who believe that relief work must be made as unattractive as possible so that the unemployed will not resort to it except in the most desperate circumstances.

These thoughts occurred to me following a conference held a few days ago between a committee representing the Newspaper Guild of New York and Victor Ridder, W.P.A. Administrator in New York City. The Guild committee had visited Mr. Ridder for the purpose of learning what his attitude would be on the formation of a Guild unit on The New Yorker Staats-Zeitung, a German-language paper published by him and his two brothers. Now, you might think that Mr. Ridder, as an official in an administration committed to the principle of collective bargaining, could answer such an inquiry in only one way: that of course he would feel obligated to say that he believed the editorial workers on The Staats-Zeitung had the right to organize. Certainly, you would hardly expect him to say that he was opposed to organization.

fact, that he shocked even the Guild, hardened as it has become to the ways of publishers. He told the committee that while he had divorced himself from the paper's management on joining up with W.P.A., he was none the less opposed to a Guild unit among the paper's employees. "If I had a vote on the matter," he said, "I would vote against it." That was shock number one and perhaps explains, in some degree, why the Guild has been able to organize virtually every editorial office in the city—with one notable exception, The Staats-Zeitung.

Even more surprising, however, was Mr. Ridder's deviation from the Roosevelt line on the five-day week. This came up in the conference rather inadvertently. Mr. Ridder had explained to the committee that his opposition to Guild organization on The Staats-Zeitung was based on several factors. The paper—yes, you've guessed it—was pretty much a "family" matter, and there were many elderly men on the staff who presented "special" problems. "We take care of a lot of men," said Mr. Ridder, "who can't do a half-day's work." This evidence of publisher generosity touched the committee deeply, but it seemed slightly inconsistent with the fact that the staff of the paper had recently seen its hours of work lengthened and was now on a six-day week.

Mr. Ridder was asked if it did not seem strange to him that while so many on the staff were unable to do a half-day's work, they were required to work longer hours than obtain on most other papers in the city. "That may be so," countered Mr. Ridder, "but I am not in favor of the five-day week. I am in favor of the six-day week. When I started in the newspaper business, I worked more than twelve hours a day."

Such sentiments, I must confess, are rather startling, coming from a man who is expected to deal sympathetically and intelligently with the unemployment problem—a man entrusted with the welfare of several hundred thousand workers in New York City. Mr. Ridder, no doubt, is anxious for private industry to reabsorb the unemployed, but clearly The Staats-Zeitung and the six-day week hardly offer the most imaginative solution at this late date. Perhaps Mr. Ridder is not typical of other W.P.A. administrators, perhaps his private beliefs have no relation whatever to the effectiveness of his work in his present position; even so, I think the opinions of a man in so important a position are of sufficient interest and consequence to merit careful attention.

Along the same line, it is worth noting a recent report on the reason for the breakdown of W.P.A. work in Pittsburgh. According to the state director in Pennsylvania, "Our program in Pittsburgh today is far from being the kind of program we would like to carry on in the city." The "House of Mellon and its hundreds of subsidiary interests," it is alleged, have tended to obstruct a worthwhile program and have kept Mayor McNair and the Public Director from coöperating with the W.P.A. organization. Incidents such as these may go just as far in explaining the failure of W.P.A. as faulty plans, inadequate preparation and so on—the usual and more pop-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

It Might Be Worth Trying

SIR: Here is a little chore that might help quite a bit and that you could do just as well as not if, as I suppose, you have access to some influential member of Congress of liberal tendencies. Get him to introduce a bill directing the Treasury Department to poll all income-tax payers on this question:

Do you favor a balanced budget on the basis of income and inheritance taxes raised to the English level? Failure to reply will be construed as a vote in the negative.

The purpose of this referendum of course would not be that of eliciting information. Everybody knows the answer: 99 percent of those who are howling for a balanced budget expect it to be done on a soak-the-poor basis and are dead against it otherwise. But to put them on the spot and force a clean-cut definition of their attitude would immensely enlighten the electorate and cut off at its source an endless torrent of hot air. The administration ought to do this without being asked, but there is something devious and crooked-shooting about the bunch that leaves small hope that they will ever of their own motion adopt such straightforward tactics.

East Jordan, Mich. F. H. FOOTE.

Labor and Peace

SIR: It seems to me that Bruce Bliven in his series on neutrality ["They Cry 'Peace, Peace'," The New Republic, October 23 and November 6 and 20] has overlooked an important cause for war and an important factor for peace. There is another factor making for war under capitalism besides the struggle for markets born of the desire to export abroad a surplus which cannot be sold at home on account of the inadequate purchasing power of the masses. If that were the only factor, some of the nations that are most strongly indicated as potential enemies by the present international set-up should be regarded as our best friends, for they are among our most substantial customers.

It is the struggle for control over backward lands and backward peoples as a sort of investment preserve for the wealthy class of the industrially advanced nations that constitutes the most important cause of imperialistic conflict between nations. Our quarrel with Japan is not that she does not allow herself to be a good customer for American goods. She is in fact a very good customer. It is at bottom a quarrel over whether we or the Japanese, meaning our capitalist class or the Japanese capitalists, shall have the right to exploit China.

The attitude of the American government toward Cuba, which we indirectly but effectively control, and the similar attitude of the British toward the teeming masses of India and the black inhabitants of her African possessions, is emphatically not one seeking to raise greatly the standard of living and the wage rates of those unhappy natives. It is on the contrary the attitude of trying to get their labor power for the investing of American or British capitalists as cheaply as possible. Instead of encouraging labor movements and strikes, which would raise the standard of living of the inhabitants of colonial possessions and make them better customers accordingly, strikes and the labor organization that is an essential prerequisite to successful strike action, are suppressed as sternly as public opinion at home will allow.

The neglect of this factor by Bruce Bliven means in turn that he has overlooked mentioning the most important ally for the peace movement, namely, organized labor. In the Scandinavian countries the working class organized politically in the Socialist Party has been the most vigorous proponent of peace activity. In this country, the American Federation of Labor is somewhat backward ideologically from a class-conscious point of view, but none the less it has taken from the beginning a bitterly antagonistic stand toward fascism and Nazism, which are the most important foci of infection for the war germs throughout the world.

British unions and the British Labor Party combined in 1920 to threaten the Lloyd George government with a general strike if they should declare war on Russia. The threat was effective; Lloyd George backed down.

In this country the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, in accordance with the left sections of the Socialist movement in Europe, has called for an independent labor boycott of Italy in the present situation. The Socialist declaration of principles calls for general strikes against war or the threat of war, though the party is obviously incapable, because of its present weakness and the weakness of organized labor, of making any such threat effective today. Yet it is this successful action by the British unions and the projected action which the Socialist Party hopes to persuade organized labor in America to adopt, that seems to offer the most effective guarantee of peace, weak though that guarantee may be today.

Cambridge, Mass. ALFRED BAKER LEWIS.

[Mr. Lewis has been unable to remember all the issues discussed in my series of articles, and I don't blame him! Not only do I agree with his first point, but I said so. Thus, in my first article, I wrote (October 23, p. 288): "They (the imperialists) want land —because land is wealth. They want subject native peoples in tropical colonies, because such semi-slave labor is cheap and profitable. They want access to raw materials, which are wealth in its elementary form. They want foreign markets for exports, preferably on a non-competitive basis, because that means maximum profits." As to his second point, in my second article (November 6, p. 354) I pointed out the hope of peace implicit in the coming to power of Left-Labor governments in France and England. In my third article I urged pacifists (November 20) "to aid by all the means at their command the creation of governments, in all countries, far enough to the left to limit the power of private capitalist enterprise to create international tension." I am sure Mr. Lewis would agree that a labor government is more effective as a force for peace than independent trade-union action, especially when a conservative government, bent on war, can so easily put the trade-union leaders in jail and mobilize all the forces of propaganda to lie to their followers.—B. B.]

A Letter from Canada

SIR: It is said that an outsider sees most of the game, which is sometimes true. Reading newspapers and listening to the radio, we on this side of the border daily read and hear of actions brought in the courts and judgments delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States which declare that the majority of the beneficial acts put in force since March, 1933, are unconstitutional in that they "deprive persons of property without due process of law." Americans justly express their derision for the arbitrary powers sometimes exercised by the British House of Lords, but appear to be quite oblivious to the fact that the Supreme Court assumes powers which, if the British House exercised them, would result in an immediate revolution in the British Isles. Not many years ago King George agreed to create 400 new peers at the request of the then government to override the intransigent House of Lords. The mere threat was sufficient.

The Canadian Constitution was formulated in 1867, and a meeting was recently held between the new Liberal government and the nine provincial premiers further to define or change the relations between the Dominion and the provinces principally with regard to finance and taxation. It is as simple as that.

What surprises me is that although I have examined many recent publications and heard some speeches, while complaints of the subserviency to or collusion with the vested interests are loud and frequent, nowhere do I find any immediate proposal to recover for the people through their Congress or executive the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vote counts for anything, the votes appear to be in favor of the Supreme Court decisions!

Vancouver, B. C. HEBERT E. TURTLE.

Civilization and Bridges

SIR: I cannot resist the pleasure of telling you how much I liked the last paragraph of the article, "Nothing to Write Home About," in The New Republic of December 25. Of course, Mr. Bliven shouldn't have "dreaded more than anything else the sight of the two new San Francisco bridges." It's the best thing Americans do—bridges. For one reason or another (which you should find out) we dare not be silly with our bridges the way we are with our courthouses, schools or dwellings.

What Mr. Bliven wrote awoke something that I felt away back in 1920 when I came to this country. He is astonished that "Americans do not stand up on their feet and build on this continent a civilization worthy of these bridges tossing their steely lace into the sky." Why don't they? Let's try again to make them—help them.

WILLIAM LESCAZE.

New York City.

For Political Refugees

SIR: I speak for the victims of political struggles throughout the world. When a controversy arises in any country between a ruling party on the one hand and groups of citizens of another persuasion on the other, many members of the second group are forced to seek refuge in foreign countries. An international pact is needed.

I propose the formation of an International Society of the Black Cross, to be modeled on the Society of the Red Cross. The purpose of the Society is to protect and assist political refugees, regardless of country of origin or reason for exile. The Black is adopted as a sign of mourning that humanity, for all its tremendous technical and cultural advance, should need an organization of this kind; and the Cross is a symbol of love of mankind. The Society shall coöperate as closely as possible with the League of Nations and with humanitarian forces in all countries.

Principal activities for the International Black Cross Society may be outlined as follows: (1) Drawing up of an international convention to be signed by the various governments of the world in which they agree to respect the Black Cross in the same manner that they now respect the Red Cross. (2) Establishment of archives giving detailed information about the rights of foreigners in various countries. (3) An employment service to list abilities and experiences of refugees and assist them in becoming self-supporting in the new land. (4) Social services to look after the health, housing and humanitarian needs of refugees. (5) Provision of cards of identity, bearing photograph and signature, these cards to be recognized as emergency passports by agreement between the various countries.

What is needed now is some adequate financial help from philanthropists and others interested to establish the organization and carry on its work. Communications addressed to me in any language will be promptly answered. My address is Halbgasse 16, Vienna VII, Austria.

Vienna, Austria. DR. PAUL POSENER.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Renewed activity on the part of the Industrial Workers of the World is reflected in correspondence from the West Coast this week. A young wage earner in Mecca, California, writes that after having attended law school in San Francisco, and later taking an active part in the Sinclair Epic movement, he is now convinced that the I.W.W. has the only true solution to the present economic situation. Their line is direct and forceful and is the one to which all leftist elements eventually will have to come, thinks this correspondent. . . . The Lumber Workers' Industrial Union No. 120 of the I.W.W. sends us a resolution adopted at a

David Kemble Eichler writes from the Evans School, Tucson, Arizona, a letter attacking Lewis Mumford, which we cannot publish in full because of the libel laws. Mr. Eichler likes Spengler and criticizes Mr. Mumford violently because Mr. Mumford doesn't.

Gregory C. Petrisor of the Carey Consolidated Schools of Carey, Idaho, speaks of the preference of high-school students for progressive journals of the type of The New Republic when such journals are made available. Mr. Petrisor thinks that all progressive elements should unite immediately in a third-party common front. He believes that Roosevelt missed a great historical opportunity to lead the country to the left and that only united political action can bring about this result in peaceful and democratic fashion.

Two schools for workers are asking for support this week. Active workers as well as persons interested in the labor movement are invited to participate in a luncheon symposium celebrating the fifteenth anniversary of Brookwood, a resident training school for labor organizers and teachers at Katonah, New York. The luncheon is being held at Frank's Hofbrau, 1680 Broadway at Fifty-second Street, New York City on January 18 at one p. m. . . . The Piney Woods Country Life School at Piney Woods, Mississippi, which gives agricultural and industrial training to Negro boys and girls, is conducting a campaign for a fund of $5,000 to keep the school open this year and is making special efforts to have sympathizers send contributions of $1 each.

Conditions in some W.P.A. projects are miserable according to a letter sent by the Provisional Committee for Action at the Fort Eustace Transient Rehabilitation Camp (W.P.A. Project No. 918) in Virginia. The Committee says that workers in the concentration camp are guarded by camp police and deputy sheriffs, are made to work long hours for wages of $15 to $25 a month, out of which they must pay for their clothes; are forced to work on United States Army aviation fields at relief wages alongside men who work at the same trade at union wages; and are allowed no voice in the conduct of the camp government. . . . A worker in Allston, Massachusetts, complains of the change in status from E.R.A. projects to W.P.A. projects. He says that "instead of paying us $85 a month for sixty-five hours of work, we will get $55 a month for one hundred and ten hours of work. This is the way the Boston W.P.A. administrators are solving the prevailing wage question."

Two projected biographies figure in our recent mail and New Republic readers are asked to contribute any relevant material they may have. A Life and Letters of Dr. Felix Adler is being prepared by his wife and daughter. Anyone having any letters in his possession is requested to send them to Miss Eleanor H. Adler at 3902 Spuyten Duyvil Parkway, Riverdale, New York. She will have copies made and the originals returned without delay. . . . L. R. Trilling is making a study of the life and work of Charles Dudley Warner (1829-1900) and would appreciate hearing from relatives and friends who may have or may know of letters, published material or personal reminiscences. Proper credit will be given for assistance and persons who have material are asked to write to L. R. Trilling, 17 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Religion figures prominently in this week's mail. An announcement is sent us of a cash prize of $15,000 to be awarded by the Bross Foundation for "the best book or manuscript, heretofore unpublished, on the connection, relation and mutual bearing of the humanities, the social sciences, the physical sciences, the biological sciences, or any branch of knowledge, with and upon the Christian religion." Manuscripts must be at least 50,000 words long and must be submitted by September 1, 1936. Full details may be had by writing to Herbert McComb Moore, president, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Almere L. Scott of the University Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin at Madison calls our attention to a valuable study course covering the history and practice of architecture which is now available to residents of Wisconsin at 50 cents a copy and at 65 cents a copy to those outside the state. . . . Dr. Archie J. Bahm of Texas Technological College at Lubbock, Texas, regards the organizing meeting of the Southwestern Philosophical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Regina Humana

Victoria Regina, by Laurence Housman. The Broadhurst Theatre, December 26, 1935.

GOOD TASTE pervades the whole presentation of "Victoria Regina." Mr. Gilbert Miller's production is generous without being overdone or vulgar in its display. The Victorian atmosphere, with Mr. Rex Whistler's décor, is completely caught. That strange semi-glamor of it, that showing of richness without quite being choice, that check on showiness along with insistence on expensiveness, and that visual design, often singularly bold, which characterized Victorian decoration, are all agreeably rendered. I have seen the Victorian décor done with dramatic suggestion, or distinction, or even poetry, but I have never seen this particular quality of ripe and luxurious Victorianism rendered so capably as we have it here from Mr. Whistler. I have seen many a palace and villa chamber of this Victorian epoch, in England—including, of course, Windsor—Germany, Italy and Spain, with the racial differences indicated, and I have observed how very ugly and clumsy and middle-class the decoration managed to be sometimes, and not rarely. It is necessary to say this in order to say that Mr. Whistler in this case has very skillfully avoided the ugly. Now and then he gives us that almost gaudy Victorian stuffiness of effect; but there is in every case a craft that picks up the whole effect into dramatic wit and punctilious stage expression.

The directing of "Victoria Regina" is cool and steady, as suits Mr. Laurence Housman's writing of the scenes. The requirements for the right acting of this play are steady and balanced rather than powerful. Passion is not required, but only a certain sense of genuine humanity and feeling beneath the formal and drab court mask. Style is not required in the manner it would be if the play dealt with a truly formal period, that of Charles II, for instance, or Le Roi Soleil, or even in the drawing room of our George Washington, not to speak of the combined audacities, extravagances and magnificence that the Elizabethan exacts. This Victorian world presented had its etiquette and restraints, no doubt, style in that sense. It had style enough as compared with present-day chaos, but much less as compared with the elegances of the eighteenth century.

The piece that we see at the Broadhurst is essentially not a play and does not pretend to be. It springs from a volume of thirty one-act plays[1] based on various incidents, characteristics or indications connected with Queen Victoria. The selector of the ten playlets given, therefore, is free to pick one or another out of these thirty pieces as the chooser decides. In a way, taking it as a whole, a tactical error has been made for the piece that Mr. Miller gives us. The first scenes, or episodes, after getting Victoria announced as queen, deal really with the development of a love affair or marriage romance. We watch the growth in relationship between this strong-willed young woman, conscious enough of her queenship, and the consort she has chosen for herself, and we see finally a perfect working together, an impressive union of people who need and complete each other. Then comes the scene of Albert's illness and the suggestion of his death. The following scene is years after. Victoria is in black, an old woman, John Brown and Disraeli come into the picture. Then we have the final scene of the Diamond Jubilee. Both these scenes are effective and go off well. But it is obvious that the break in continuity, felt at the start of the last two scenes, and the sense of let-down, are due to the misleading cue in the previous scenes: the relations of Victoria and Albert promised to be the drama, but now we have only one-act episodes. I do not say I would have chosen differently when it come to choosing among these thirty one-act pieces. I only say that, as sound theatre stuff, an effect of a sheer series of one-act episodic pieces would have been more solid. It could have been achieved, perhaps, by inserting a scene with the Ministers or otherwise, at least some scene that did not deal at all with Albert. The acting, however, bridged the gap.

Can it be claimed for Victoria, Mr. Housman asks in his introduction to the volume of the thirty one-act plays, that she, to any comparable extent, molded history? Not really, in any positive extent, certainly not, but negatively she had a power and a "way with her." The mind of Victoria was sedentary, and during the last two-thirds of her reign there was no important reform but aroused her suspicions. Indeed, at times her opposition took underhand and shady forms. In the sixties and early seventies, after Albert's death, her strict retirement resulted in a somewhat violent unpopularity, then she came back as the figurehead of that spectacular imperialism that eventually culminated in the shameless Boer War. It is worth while noting, since our simple American minds repeatedly accept the British pap of belief in the Empire's being free, that, as the dramatist says, "though a wise liberality over documents, dealing with the official side of her reign, has allowed her real character to become public property, her personality is still reckoned too sacred for the Censor to allow of its stage representation"—in other words, the original play is forbidden production on the London stage.

As a play, this "Victoria Regina" cannot hold a candle to the "Queen Victoria" by Walter Prichard Eaton and David Carb, produced by Equity in 1923. What's more, Mr. Price is nothing at all beside Ulrich Haupt, who was amazingly convincing in the role of the Prince Consort. We cannot stay on that, it is more punctual to say now that Mr. Price, whose first stage role this is, we hear, is fair enough. The resemblance to Albert is considered remarkable, and Mr. Price's acting is simple and in excellent taste, and by its very technical limitations—a matter of nervousness with one's cuff, for example, to take the tiniest matter—serves to some extent to confirm the genuineness of his effect. Miss Helen Hayes gives the very best performance of her career. A certain quietness and self-effacement have only underscored her own share in her portrayal. You could not say that there is any great suggestion of the British Empire in Miss Hayes's impersonation, nor, for that matter, was there much of that German mass and unalterability of the Queen. But the whole conception is solid and convincing, beautifully

LICENSED TO JNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC COPY RESTRICTED TO PURCHASERS

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Two Sides of the Barricades

IN PARIS, just after the Italians marched into Ethiopia, there appeared four documents of unusual interest to writers and readers. Taken together, they show how the French literary world has been rocked and torn apart by the crisis. They show what sort of writers are drifting to which side.

The first of these documents is a pro-Fascist manifesto entitled "For the Defense of Culture." Pompous and furibund, it has to be quoted at some length:

> An attempt is being made to launch the European nations against Rome. People do not hesitate to call Italy a culprit, to point her out to the world as a common enemy. . . .
>
> It is not without amazement that we see a nation whose colonial empire occupies a fifth of the world opposing the justifiable undertakings of young Italy, and see this nation light-heartedly adopting the dangerous myth of the absolute equality of all nations—a course of action that has, under the circumstances, won it the support of all the revolutionary forces now making use of the same theory to fight the Italian government at home, and, simultaneously, to deliver all Europe to the desired upheavals.
>
> To this fatal alliance, Geneva lends the formidable support of a bogus internationalism that tries to establish equality between the superior and the inferior, the civilized man and the savage. The result of this fury for equality is . . . the sanctions, which, in order to halt the civilizing conquest of one of the most backward regions in the world (where even Christianity has had no effect) would not hesitate to unchain a universal conflict, nor to unite all anarchies and all disorders against a country where, during the last fifteen years, we have seen affirmed, enhanced, organized and fortified some of the essential virtues of the highest humanity.
>
> This fratricidal conflict . . . would be not only a crime against peace but an unpardonable assault upon occidental civilization. . . . We intellectuals, who should protect culture with all the more vigilance because we profit more from its blessings, cannot let civilization choose against itself. To prevent such a suicide, we appeal to all the forces of the spirit.

This is an amazing document, especially when you consider that it was composed and circulated, not by the Italian ambassador, not by Dr. Goebbels in Berlin, but by a fairly prominent French writer. It was also signed by sixty-three others, including twelve members of the Academy. Maurice Donnay, Abel Hermant, Henry Bordeaux, Claude Farrère —many of us can remember these names from our college days. But the names of the signers are vastly more imposing than their combined literary production in the year 1935. On examination you will find that most of these writers have one feature in common, namely, that they have ceased to be writers primarily. They are now official figures—pundits or gaffers, hand-shakers, head-shakers, scolders of the young, unveilers of monuments, fountain-heads of anger and unction. Read the latest books of those among them who are still writing books and you will have [illegible] Cathedral. It couldn't happen here, not yet, at any rate.

Just before this first document was published, it fell into the hands of the left-wing writers. At a public meeting they scribbled a "Reply to the Fascist Intellectuals," of which two sentences are enough to quote:

> The undersigned are astonished to see French signatures affirming the inequality in rights of the different human races, an idea absolutely opposed to our tradition and insulting to a great many members of our community. They regret that sixty-four intellectuals of our country, at the very moment when the League of Nations is justifying its existence in the eyes of all men of good faith, should launch an attack on it that mingles impertinence with inconsequence.

This second document as a whole is too hastily written to be a masterpiece of literary art or juristic reasoning. It is chiefly remarkable for the names that are signed to it: Alain, Aragon, Bloch, Benda, Chamson, Durtain, Gide, Giono, Louis Guilloux, Roger Martin du Gard, André Malraux, Romain Rolland, Charles Vildrac—these and hundreds of others, including, for a surprise, Henry de Montherlant and Jules Romains. There are not many literary placeholders in the list; there is not a single member of the French Academy. On the other hand, there are most of the men who are doing good work now, who are keeping alive the tradition of French literature instead of embalming it.

It happens that they were not the only group to answer the sixty-four intellectuals. A considerable number of Catholic writers and editors and professors issued a third document, entitled "For Justice and Peace." They attacked the pro-Fascist manifesto on two grounds: first, for implying that violations of international law are natural and pardonable in the case of colonial conquests, and second, for proclaiming the inequality of races, a sophistry that is "pure paganism."—"Every thoughtful man will dread the use to which later aggressors can put these same doctrines of the inequality of races and the unimportance of breaking international engagements."

"For Justice and Peace" was signed by three famous writers: François Mauriac, Francis Jammes and Paul Claudel. It was also signed by many dignitaries of the Church: a bishop, two monsignori, a vicar general, a whole flock of assorted canons. And it became the occasion for the fourth of these documents, one that reveals the broad base on which French liberals and radicals are trying to build a People's Front.

Several left-wing writers—Gide, Chamson and others—sent an open letter to the authors of the Catholic manifesto. They said: "You have nobly expressed the principles that should serve as a basis for examining the problem imposed on our consciences by recent events. We agree with you in emphasizing the need for upholding, above all, the idea of and the will for justice." Therefore, "we take this opportunity of requesting you to add our signatures to those of your friends." Imagine a similar situation in the United States. A dozen contributors to The New Masses beg for the privilege of signing a proclamation sponsored by the Bishop of Dayton, say, and the Dean of St. Patrick's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War and Peace[1]

Mars His Idiot, by H. M. Tomlinson. New York: Harper and Brothers. 230 pages. $2.50.

War: No Glory, No Profit, No Need, by Norman Thomas. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. 246 pages. $1.50.

The Coming World War, by T. H. Wintringham. New York: Thomas Seltzer. 257 pages. $2.50.

WAR IS hell. This observation is older than General Sherman. It has been reiterated through the ages by thousands of writers. It is accepted as true by everybody in the contemporary world save the blood-crazed fascist dictators and their enslaved and deluded followers. The peoples who live under liberal or communist regimes know that war is hell. The people who live under fascism are forbidden to know. Those who write more books to demonstrate the hellishness of war probably convince no one save those already convinced. What is more to the point, the hellishness of war has never deterred governments and peoples from fighting. The beast in man is attracted to war precisely because of its hellishness.

These considerations suggest that books on war and peace deserve to be evaluated by some criterion other than their persuasiveness in showing that war is evil. The reflective reader must ask what contribution they make to an understanding of the causes of war and the prerequisites of peace. Quack "cures" for war are as ancient and multitudinous as indictments of war itself. What is needed is less quackery, demonstration and exhortation, and more scientific analysis and prescription. Measured by this yardstick, Tomlinson's latest book is of no importance, Norman Thomas' essay is of considerable interest and Wintringham's volume is almost (thought not quite) deserving of John Strachey's introductory statement that one page of it is "worth all the libraries of well intentioned books against war which are now pouring from the presses in both England and America."

Tomlinson, in a score of bright little articles interlarded with poetry and apt quotations, proves again that war is hell. Here is no analysis, but *belles lettres*—charming, colorful, conversational. Life is important; death is important; warships are "figures of squat malevolence"; disemboweling by shrapnel is unpleasant; female entrails scattered over factory machinery by air bombs are not pretty. War is foul, hideous, bestial and inconceivably stupid. We know this. So what? His only answer is: Come to Jesus!

The first hundred pages of Norman Thomas' little book are not much better. With his usual eloquent sincerity, he also proves that war is hell. But he knows that Jesus will not suffice. The cause of war? Capitalism and nationalism. Property. Profits. The cure? Socialism and working-class solidarity. The League of Nations is a failure. Sanctions are a failure. An American peace policy should include an impartial arms and loan embargo against all belligerents and prospective belligerents (is belligerency like pregnancy, that it can be detected in advance?); disarmament by example and abandonment of the Stimson Doctrine and the "Open Door" in China; renunciation of imperialism; repeal of the Asiatic exclusion laws; "isolation from all that makes for war—coöperation with all that makes for peace." All this, plus the pressure of organized workers prepared to strike against mobilization, plus a new education and a vision of brotherhood, plus revolution (perhaps), will possibly preserve peace, suggests Mr. Thomas with fine hesitancy and moderation.

Mr. T. H. Wintringham is England's leading Marxist authority on military strategy. His book is military and political science. The military science is better than the political science. He writes ably on the mechanics and technique of war in the machine age. An appendix on the tactics of war in the Far East is brilliant. The next war, he thought in March, 1935, when the book went to press, will begin with a Japanese attack upon Siberia, coupled with Nazi aggression in Europe, probably directed also against the U.S.S.R. Modern wars end in social revolution. Organized labor must act for peace by preparing the social revolution. The Labor Party and the Social Democrats are wrong. The League is wrong and sanctions are wrong. Labor must never support any war by a capitalist government. (He was writing before the Seventh Congress of the Comintern which completely reversed this position.) The workers' revolution is the only road to peace.

All these books fall short of their mark because they are too much concerned with war in general and not enough concerned with a realistic appraisal of the immediate threat to peace today and tomorrow. The liberal Tomlinson looks backward: "To Unknown Warriors." The socialist, Thomas, looks to a too remote future: "To My Children's Generation." The communist, Wintringham, looks to tomorrow ("To Those Who Are Ready"), but, like Thomas, he cannot see the forest for the trees. He imagines that peace is equally threatened by all capitalistic nationalisms and imperialisms and that war can be averted by proletarian revolution in all countries.

The immediate issue is far simpler. Peace advocates cannot hope to cure war in general if they have not the wit to analyze the sources of the war which is just around the corner. Fire prevention is irrelevant when the house is already burning down. Peace is not, here and now, threatened by British imperialism or French nationalism or American capitalism. These ruling classes are not now threatening anyone with aggression, nor have they yet strangled the pacifists and proletarians within their borders. Peace is threatened, peace has already been broken, only by fascism. The power-drunk and war-mad dictators at Rome and Tokyo are already waging wars of shameless aggression against their weaker neighbors. Hitler will do likewise if he sees a favorable opening. To imagine that *this* war can be stopped by working-class action is nonsense. The Italian, German and Japanese workers are helpless helots. Only in the democratic states, which will be the victims of fascist attack, can proletarian revolt interfere with war-making and, if attempted here, its first effect would be to aid the fascist enemy.

This lesson has already been learned by the Moscow realists, the French radicals, and all the liberals, socialists and communists of Europe. Fascism can be stopped only by the collective action of all democratic and communist nations. The League is the only possible vehicle of such action. Sanctions are its only possible instruments. Motives are unimportant. What is important is the halting of fascist aggression by any and all means at hand. Militant fascism breathes ruin and death to all the non-fascist world. Fascist imperialism, if crushed at all, will be crushed by collective international action through the League and in no other way. Some fighting may be necessary (only fools

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

League fails through Tory treachery, fascist intrigue, liberal indifference, radical sabotage or American stupidity, then all is lost and the peace-seekers will cry despairingly in a desolate and bloody wilderness, blasted by Araki's artillery, Mussolini's machine guns and Hitler's bombing planes.

A major danger to the success of the League is American isolationism. That Mr. Thomas and American liberals should play the fascist game by urging American aloofness would be incredible were it not a tragic fact. No single step could do more to make the world safe for fascist aggression than an American policy of "impartial" embargoes against aggressors, victims of aggression and those seeking to halt aggression. If this is to become the American policy of "neutrality," then the United States will in effect become the ally of fascist Italy, Nazi Germany and imperialist Japan and will wreck the collective security system. Mr. Thomas sees this vaguely and suggests "exceptions" to aid the victims of aggression. But only the exceptions make sense. The policy does not. To imagine that the United States can protect itself from war and fascism by encouraging fascist war-makers everywhere is worse than nonsense; it is rank folly. And to imagine that *this* war can be stopped by American isolationism is unadulterated lunacy. The administration knows this if Congress and the public do not. At this eleventh hour, it is time for all liberals, all friends of peace, all enemies of fascism, to support Geneva. If they do not, if they cause the League to fail in its supreme test, then the battle is already lost and the curtain had best be rung down on a civilization too short-sighted to save itself from the destroyers.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN.

The Oneida Experiment

A Yankee Saint: John Humphrey Noyes and the Oneida Community, by Robert Allerton Parker. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 322 pages. $3.75.

EARLY in the eighteen thirties a deeply religious young Vermonter, John Humphrey Noyes, joined a circle known as The Brethren. Its members were preparing to go as missionaries to remote and dangerous parts of the earth, and eventually most of them did. Noyes, however, was "destined to remain in his own native land . . . to come into collision with taboos even more rigidly enforced than those of any tribe in equatorial Africa . . . and finally to be driven into exile for his attempt to establish the Kingdom of Heaven in the United States of America." But before this happened he founded and guided for thirty years a number of flourishing communities based on the principles of complete Christian communism and perfectionism. Among the adult members of these communities he inaugurated the system of "complex marriage" and a bold eugenic experiment which he called "stirpiculture."

In the beginning, birth control by Noyes's method of "Male Continence" was the general rule of the communities. It is worth noting that this was the result of Noyes's brooding over the suffering of his wife in continual and unsuccessful pregnancies. No ascetic, he believed in the right of men and women to sexual experience, but he sought always to lift this experience to a level where it harmonized with his conception of a perfect Christian life. His interest in birth control was not merely negative. As early as 1848 he written in his "Bible Communism": "We are in [illegible]

culture and so great was his influence among the community members that eighty-five young men and women voluntarily signed papers agreeing to propagate only as "Father" Noyes should decree. The young men said in part: "The undersigned . . . offer ourselves to be used in forming any combinations that may seem to you desirable. We claim no rights. We ask no privileges. We desire to be servants of the truth." During the next ten years fifty-eight living children were born under the stirpicultural regime. Of these, Noyes is known to have fathered nine. It was not to be expected, however, that Noyes could indefinitely challenge the basic morality of the society in which he lived. A hue and cry stirred up by clerical zealots eventually forced a retreat from "complex marriage." The defeat and exile of Noyes was soon followed by dissolution of the community, already weakened internally by factional strife and by a revolt of its young members.

Mr. Parker's conscientious and carefully documented biography has rescued from near oblivion a figure of both historic and contemporary importance. The problems with which Noyes struggled are still partly unsolved but, as this book makes clear, his thinking about them was astonishingly modern and courageous. Mr. Parker's able recreation of the Puritan and frontier backgrounds from which this thinking emerged lends striking confirmation to Havelock Ellis' judgment of Noyes as "a very great figure, one of the noblest pioneers America has produced."

MARTHA GRUENING.

A New Parish

Men and Brethren, by James Gould Cozzens. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

A YOUNG clergyman in charge of a New York parish is the pivot of several human problems. During two days of a week-end, he touches the tangled affairs of a woman in love with him, of another who is about to leave her husband, of still another for whose ruin he may himself be partially responsible, of a fellow priest who has disgraced himself and whose faith can no longer sustain him, of his assistant, a Christian Socialist, etc. Incidentally he reasserts his own soul's safety.

This brief summary should indicate that there is little action in the book, that it is essentially a novel of reflection, the first in which Cozzens concerns himself with a problem that cannot be resolved on the physical level. One may not be satisfied with the solution of the Episcopal priest, Ernest Cudlipp, certain of his own religious faith and rather arrogant in it, but frequently inadequate to deal satisfactorily with the problems of less positive souls in a chaotic metropolitan world. On the other hand, the man's conviction is enviable, and his fine restatement of it at the end of the book very moving indeed; and the fact that it is a conviction incapable of sustaining others as it does himself gives it its poignancy.

In successfully developing this theme, Cozzens moves beyond the tradition of Kipling, with whom he has been compared. His impersonality, the ability to move easily from the robust country doctor of "Adam" to the madman of "Castaway" to the positive and subtle Cudlipp, is adequate indication of his scope, the most important single factor in his career. He has the vital gift of growth, will not write himself out; and while "Men and Brethren"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

About T. S. Eliot

Murder in the Cathedral, by T. S. Eliot. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 87 pages. $1.25.

IF MR. T. S. Eliot is still, as he once said he was in a now hackneyed phrase, a royalist, a classicist and an Anglo-Catholic, it must be—to judge from "The Rock" and this new play—a singularly lukewarm royalist, a classicist in an extremely special and narrow sense and, it would seem to an uninitiated outsider, even an Anglo-Catholic *sui generis*. A royalist, in the late and melancholy year 1935, would have some confidence, one would think, in a political program, no matter how grotesque it might appear to an old-fashioned democrat; a classicist would have some of the Greek passion for morals and politics, some of the Roman tough-mindedness; and one would suppose that an orthodox Christian would render Caesar's things to Caesar, would insist on the firm (if debased) reality of the physical world, and view the life of man with pity and charity instead of with a psychopathic revulsion.

No doubt these plays are sound enough in their Anglo-Catholicism. They have both been performed under ecclesiastical auspices, and it is hardly for a materialist to challenge their orthodoxy. Just the same, what comes out in these modern mysteries seems to be a strain of thought and feeling far too negatory to be described as either truly classical or truly Christian, to say nothing of its being truly feudal. It is of Buddha's Fire Sermon or one of the Upanishads or at least "Ecclesiastes" that one is made to think, and not of the Sermon on the Mount or the Nichomachean Ethics. A profound and as it were Hindu sense of the evil of existence itself and the utter illusoriness of all natural being; the turning away, as of a man unbearably sick, from the spectacle of the human lot: this, despite the Catholic imagery, the traditional diction, appears to be the psychological unity of these plays.

Archbishop Thomas à Becket speaks not only as an upholder of ecclesiastical power at the expense of the monarchy, but as a man to whom all worldly power is phantasmagoric and meaningless:

> Temporal power, to build a good world,
> To keep order, as the world knows order.
> Those who put their faith in worldly order
> Not controlled by the order of God,
> In confident ignorance, but arrest disorder,
> Make it fast, breed fatal disease,
> Degrade what they exalt.

This is surely royalism with a difference. And Thomas is not allowed to yield to the temptation to champion the cause of the people against the king:

> If the Archbishop cannot trust the Throne,
> He has good cause to trust none but God alone,
> It is not better to be thrown
> To a thousand hungry appetites than to one.

This is the Archbishop's version of Paul's charity, and the play is indeed so misanthropic that it blames the people rather than the king for a murder committed under his orders. Because the common people "fear the injustice of men less than the justice of God," they are represented as bearing upon their guilty heads "the blood of the martyrs and the agony of the saints," including that of Thomas.

There is a certain stylistic neutrality in much of the verse his extraordinary talents. The two most notable of these are perhaps the speech of Thomas which utters—with an exasperating Brahmanical drone of iteration—the eternality of the turning wheel that signifies the endless circle of action and suffering; and the chorus of the women of Canterbury which, on the verge of the murder of Thomas by the knights, crawls and quivers with almost insane horror at the thought of physical nature and the evil energies in it:

> I have smelt them, the death-bringers . . .
> I have seen
> Gray necks twisting, rat tails twining, in the thick
> light of dawn . . .
> I have seen
> Trunk and horn, tusk and hoof, in odd places . . .
> I have seen
> Rings of light coiling downwards, leading
> To the horror of the ape.

After the murder, the same chorus breaks out with an hysterical appealing cry for the quick and thorough cleansing of a world nightmarishly defiled with blood; and then the four murderous knights step forward to the front of the stage and, like four banal modern Englishmen, address the audience with jesuitical defenses of their crime. There is a final chorus of praise, but on one reader at least "Murder in the Cathedral" impresses much less the glory of martyrdom than the dreamlike unreality (as Mr. Eliot sees them) of all temporal things, the guilty vileness of mankind and the monstrousness of nature. For a Christian poet the note of the "Inferno" seems easier to catch, in this generation, than the note of the "Paradiso."

NEWTON ARVIN.

The Achievement of T. S. Eliot, by F. O. Matthiessen. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 173 pages. $2.25.

MR. MATTHIESSEN believes very strongly in Mallarmé's dictum "that what matters is not what a poem says, but what it *is*," and in his attempt to show what Eliot's poetry really is, he has clarified, placed and appraised the poems both singly and as a whole, while continuing to emphasize those literary traditions that have had an influence on Eliot—the Elizabethan dramatists, the metaphysical poets, the nineteenth-century symbolists and Dante. The values of Mr. Matthiessen's method are obvious: certain particular elements in the poet's experience, elements too often confused in the critic's mind as part of a general summary, can now be identified; there is also no need and in fact no opportunity for the trite generalizations that lead so many students of Eliot into speculating whether the man has or has not a heart.

Mr. Matthiessen's book thus acts as a spur. Though he has tried to avoid aimless theorizing, his careful analyses and insights, with their reminder of Eliot's extraordinary indebtedness to scholarship and his artist's way of fitting these borrowings to the urgency of his needs, help to clarify one's own notions about Eliot and the forces influencing him. It is much easier, after reading Mr. Matthiessen, to understand why Eliot's first poems make a Donne conceit seem more comprehensible, even more inevitable. Mr. Matthiessen's sympathetic account of Eliot's religious preoccupations corroborates an idea that doubtless has occurred to many modern students of the metaphysical poets—that the treatment of light in "The Rock" is a brilliant justification and explanation of the celestial imagery that obsessed Henry Vaughan, and before

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hesitantly worded passage to the effect that Eliot is the heir of an involved, imported Puritan literary tradition. He is better taken up, I think, with problems of technique, and his chapter "On the Auditory Imagination" is the best account of non-romantic diction and rhythm anyone has written since Paul Elmer More deserted to the higher mysteries. A large part of the book propounds, and often convincingly, the argument that there aren't so many hollow spaces between Eliot's bones of greatness as one might imagine. ALFRED KAZIN.

Books in Brief

The Great Tradition, by Granville Hicks. Revised edition. New York: The Macmillan Company. 355 pages. $2.

IT WOULD not be easy to say mathematically how much the new proletarian writing owes to "The Great Tradition," which first appeared two years ago; but everyone knows that the debt to the book has been a very large one, and it indicates a situation surprisingly advanced in so short a term that Mr. Hicks should now be bringing out a new edition of the book, with a wholly rewritten final chapter given over to the Marxist novelists, playwrights and poets. The chapter is written with great spirit and force, as was to have been predicted, and it will certainly be a tonic not only to all the writers dealt with but to many others. Besides, the book as a whole can hardly be circulated too widely. It is full of things that incite discussion, and probably many of those who subscribe to its general political position will want to dissent from the special application at one point or another. Certainly Mr. Hicks leaves ground still to be gained in the intricate task of bringing together many orders of thought and knowledge —sociology, psychology, rhetoric, esthetics and the like— and fusing them in a harmonious critical whole. This is almost equivalent, however, to saying that the book is the work of a courageous literary scout, and that for a long time to come Marxist writers on American literature will have to and will want to make their reckoning with "The Great Tradition." N. A.

Genetics and the Social Order, by Mark Graubard. New York: Tomorrow Publishers. 127 pages. 75 cents.

This little book by a research geneticist of Columbia University has a large significance as one of the first *systematic* attempts by an American scientist to apply the Marxist principles to the materials and methods of Genetics (H. J. Muller has also done this, but only in occasional articles). Dr. Graubard attacks the current fallacies of eugenics and racial "science," exposing the socio-economic roots of these fallacies and shrewdly analyzing the class nature not only of Nazi anti-Semitism but of the entire structure of the Aryan and other racial myths. He does this from the solid ground of ascertained facts in the domains of genetics and anthropology. H. W.

Sussman Sees It Through, by David Goldberg. New York: Bloch Publishing Company. 244 pages. $2.

Mr. Goldberg's "reappraisal of the Jewish position under the Soviets" is one that has become unavoidable. The old Jewish leaders may hate the Soviet as men of property, they may hate it as men of religion, but can they continue to hate it as Jews? Not unless they are prepared to exclude from Jewry the rebellious poor and the irreligious. The Soviet has made an end of pogroms. It treats anti-Semitism as a crime against the state. It has conferred upon the Jews equal rights and has even offered them a territory in

Books for Readers and Writers

READING AND WRITING

THE WRITER'S ART, edited by Rolo Walter Brown. $2.50. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

WRITING FOR PROFIT, by Donald Wilhelm. $3.00. Whittlesey House, 330 West 42nd Street, New York.

THE CRAFT OF FICTION, by Percy Lubbock. $2. Peter Smith, 347 Fifth Ave., New York.

DICTIONARIES

DICTIONARY OF FOREIGN TERMS. Found in English and American Writings of Yesterday and Today, by C. O. Sylvester Mawson, $2.00. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 393 Fourth Avenue, N. Y.

CROWELL'S DICTIONARY OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR: A Handbook of American Usage, by Maurice H. Weseen, 714 pages, 8vo, Cloth $3.50. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 393 Fourth Avenue, New York.

DICTIONARY OF PHRASE AND FABLE, by E. C. Brewer. New edition, popular price. $3.50. J. B. Lippincott Co., Washington Sq., Phila.

STANDARD DICTIONARY SERIES; NEW STANDARD DICTIONARY (Unabridged). The one great authority on words. Buckram, indexed, $18; sheep, indexed, $22. **PRACTICAL STANDARD DICTIONARY**, cloth, $5; Fabrikoid, $6; Full Leather, $7.50. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 354 Fourth Ave., New York.

QUOTATIONS

HOYT'S NEW CYCLOPEDIA OF PRACTICAL QUOTATIONS, revised by Kate Louise Roberts. $7.50. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 354 Fourth Ave., New York.

THE HOME BOOK OF QUOTATIONS, classic and modern, including recent American; 72,000 quotations. Index d b

Note

This directory, published in the third issue of every month, is designed to advertise those Standard Works of Reference, Handbooks, Dictionaries, and Anthologies and such helps for readers and writers as will be of particular interest to the audience that The New Republic reaches. The books here presented have been carefully selected by the various publishers with the needs of the intelligent reader and practicing or developing writer especially in mind. The New Republic feels that in the monthly publication of this directory a real service will be performed for both its readers and the publishers. Because its content will vary from month to month, we suggest that you regularly check the listings for your immediate needs.

LITERARY HISTORY

THE FOREGROUND OF AMERICAN FICTION

POETRY AND PROSE

THE USE OF POETRY AND THE USE OF CRITICISM, by T. S. Eliot. $2.00. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

ENGLISH POETS: ROMANTIC, VICTORIAN AND LATER, by James Stephens, E. L. Beck and R. H. Snow, with Introduction by Stephens. $6. **ENGLISH ROMANTIC POETS**, $3. **VICTORIAN AND LATER**, $4. American Book Co., 88 Lexington Ave., New York.

ANTHOLOGIES

GREAT AMERICANS AS SEEN BY THE POETS, an anthology by Burton Stevenson. $3.50. J. P. Lippincott Co., Washington Sq., Phila.

AN ANTHOLOGY OF LIGHT VERSE, Edited by Louis Kronenberger. No. 48 in the MODERN LIBRARY, 95c. Send for list of 236 titles, to: 20 E. 57 St., N. Y. City.

ENCYCLOPEDIA

NEW INTERNATIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA. Popular-priced edition. Write for full particulars. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 354 Fourth Ave., New York.

HANDBOOKS

WORDS CONFUSED AND MISUSED, by Maurice H. Weseen, $2.00. "More intelligently compiled than any other book." Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 393 Fourth Avenue, New York.

DESK BOOK OF ERRORS IN ENGLISH, $1.50; **DESK BOOK OF 25,000 WORDS FREQUENTLY MISPRONOUNCED**, $2.50; **HOW TO USE ENGLISH**, $2.50; **HOW TO SPEAK ENGLISH EFFECTIVELY**, $1.75; and **WORDS WE MISSPELL**, $1.50, by Frank H. Vizetelly. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 354 Fourth Ave., New York.

GENERAL

UNAUTHORIZED DUPLICATING ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which they may, if they choose, establish an autonomous republic. Mr. Goldberg also points out that the Jewish petty bourgeois—farmers, small traders and artisans—are adapting themselves to the requirements of the new social order and are rapidly freeing themselves of the invidious distinction that attaches to their class origin—not as Jews, but as bourgeois. Thus far Mr. Goldberg is on firm ground. But his argument becomes hazy when he reasons that the Jews of the Soviet Union are bound to survive and to continue forever as a distinct element of the population: we simply have not the data from which to draw a conclusion one way or the other. H. S.

A Correction

In a review of "The Poems of W. H. Davies" and "Love Poems," by W. H. Davies, in The New Republic of January 8, the publisher was given by error as The Viking Press. The books were published by The Oxford University Press.

Contributors

MORTON TAYLOR for the past ten years has been a reporter on various Middle Western newspapers, and is now doing free-lance writing on political topics. He is associated with the liberal faction in the Republican Party.

JOHN VINCENT HEALY is assistant librarian at Massachusetts State College. His book reviews and verse have been published in The Saturday Review of Literature, Poetry and The New Frontier.

DR. KURT ROSENFELD, a refugee from Germany, was formerly Minister of Justice in Prussia and was a member of the German Reichstag for thirteen years. He now lives in New York City.

SAMUEL PAUL PUNER is legislative counsel to the American Civil Liberties Union. He is a member of the firm of Sabin and Puner of the New York Bar.

JAMES WECHSLER has just assumed the editorship of The Student Advocate, which is to be the monthly publication of the new Student Union. He is the author of "Revolt on the Campus," recently published.

NATHAN ASCH is a New York novelist whose most recent book, "The Valley," was published in October.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN is assistant professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago. His books include "International Politics" and "The Nazi Dictatorship."

MARK SCHORER studied at the University of Wisconsin and at Harvard, and is now a member of the English faculty at Wisconsin. His novel, "A House Too Old," was recently published by Reynal and Hitchcock.

NEWTON ARVIN was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship for 1935-36 and is working on a book about Walt Whitman.

MARTHA GRUENING was born in Massachusetts, lived for a time in Paris and now makes her home in New York City. She has contributed articles and reviews to various magazines.

ALFRED KAZIN has written book reviews for The New Republic, The Herald Tribune Books, Scribner's and The New York Times Book Review.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Newton Arvin, Harold Ward and Herman Simpson.

LENIN POINTS THE WAY!

"The unity of the proletariat is its greatest weapon in the struggle for a socialist revolution."

BUILD THE UNITED FRONT AGAINST WAR AND FASCISM!

LENIN MEMORIAL MEETING

SPEAKERS: EARL BROWDER, Gen. Sec., Communist Party of the U.S.A.
JAMES ASHFORD, Harlem Organizer, Y. C. L.
I. AMTER, District Organizer, CHAIRMAN

MASS PAGEANT CHORUS OF 300 I. W. O. BAND

Monday evening, January 20th, 1936, at 8 P. M.

MADISON SQUARE GARDEN
50th Street & 8th Avenue

Tickets: 35c, 55c, 83c, on sale at Workers Bookshop, 50 E. 13th Street.
Auspices: New York District, Communist Party of the United States.
BUILD THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY

THE THEATRE GUILD *Presents*
(in association with JOHN C. WILSON)
LAST WEEK
The Taming of the Shrew
with ALFRED LUNT & LYNN FONTANNE
GUILD THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway
Evgs. 8:40. Matinees Thursday & Saturday, 2:40

THE THEATRE GUILD *Presents*
GEORGE GERSHWIN'S
PORGY and BESS
Book by Du Bose Heyward
Lyrics by Du Bose Heyward and Ira Gershwin
Directed by ROUBEN MAMOULIAN
Orchestra conducted by Alexander Smallens
ALVIN THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway. Evgs. 8:40, Matinees: Thursday and Saturday, 2:40

"'Paradise Lost' should be seen by every intelligent theatregoer. This production is an event in the history of the American stage: an event of both aesthetic and social importance."—*Waldo Frank.*
PARADISE LOST
By Clifford Odets
LONGACRE THEATRE 48th Street West of Broadway. Eves. 8:30. Mats. Wed. & Sat. 2:30

The Classified rate of The New Republic is $4 an inch for one insertion, $3.50 an inch for three insertions, $3.00 an inch for six insertions. Larger space, proportionately more. Advertising Department, 40 East 49th St., N. Y. C.

BANQUET

HISTORIC OCCASION!
MOTHER BLOOR
45th Anniversary Banquet
FRIDAY JAN. 24th
HEYWOOD BROUN, Toastmaster
Outstanding Program
Hotel Lismore — 7 P. M. — $1.50
MOTHER BLOOR ANNIV. COMMITTEE,
100 Fifth Ave., AL 4-5105

LANGUAGES

23 LANGUAGES
SPEAK ANY MODERN LANGUAGE IN 3 MONTHS BY LINGUAPHONE
UNIQUE METHOD BRINGS VOICES OF NATIVE MASTERS INTO YOUR OWN HOME..SEND FOR FREE BOOK
LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
41 Rockefeller Center · New York

TRAVEL

RUSSIAN TOURS $231.00
Leadership: Jerome Davis of Yale, Professor Lucy Textor of Vassar, Dr. Julius Hecker and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana. Routed via England, Denmark and Finland at no extra cost. Round table discussions with Soviet leaders.
Write for Booklet C
WILLIAM M. BARBER
BABSON PARK MASS.

SOCIAL INSURANCE

T S A (Terminable Securities Act.) Provides for an orderly and equitable liquidation of capital values without loss of immediate income. Unless some such plan is adopted some of us believe we are in for a violent crash of all values. We may be wrong but certainly T S A is entitled to a candid and intelligent report from the S.E.C. to whom it was referred by the N.R.A. last March. Enclose 3c-stamp for a copy of "Passing the buck at Washington." Only a few left.
Box 1163, Boston, Mass.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUBS

Why not let our FRIENDSHIP CLUB banish that isolation of spirit, mind, heart? Fine types. Box 670, Seattle, Washington. Enclose postage.

TAKE HOLIDAY FROM BUNK!
CONTACTS connects you with debunked, intelligent liberals everywhere. Unusual

ORANGES FOR SALE

POSITION WANTED
YOUNG WOMAN: magazine, editorial, varied research,

LICENSED TO NYU
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED